



ILLINOIS

---

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

**PRODUCTION NOTE**

University of Illinois at  
Urbana-Champaign Library  
Large-scale Digitization Project, 2007.

# *Library Trends*

---

*Junior College Libraries*

CHARLES L. TRINKNER  
*Issue Editor*

---

*October, 1965*

# Library Trends

A Publication of the University of Illinois Graduate  
School of Library Science

## *Managing Editor*

HERBERT GOLDHOR

## *Assistant to Editor*

JEAN SOMERS

## *Publications Board*

ROBERT B. DOWNS

HERBERT GOLDHOR

FRANCES B. JENKINS

ALICE LOHRER

ROLLAND E. STEVENS

ARNOLD H. TROTIER

LUCIEN W. WHITE

LIBRARY TRENDS, a quarterly journal of librarianship, provides a medium for evaluative recapitulation of current thought and practice, searching for those ideas and procedures which hold the greatest potentialities for the future.

Each issue is concerned with one aspect of librarianship. Each is planned with the assistance of an invited advisory editor. All articles are by invitation. Suggestions for future issues are welcomed and should be sent to the Managing Editor.

Published four times a year, in July, October, January, and April. Office of Publication: University of Illinois Graduate School of Library Science, Urbana, Illinois. Entered as second-class matter June 25, 1952, at the Post Office at Urbana, Illinois, under the act of August 24, 1912. Copyright 1965 by the University of Illinois Board of Trustees. All rights reserved.

Subscription price is \$6.00 a year. Individual issues are priced at \$2.00. Address orders to Subscription Department, University of Illinois Press, Urbana, Illinois. Editorial correspondence should be sent to LIBRARY TRENDS, University of Illinois Graduate School of Library Science, Urbana, Illinois. Indexed in *Library Literature*, *Library Science Abstracts*, and PAIS.

# Library Trends

VOLUME 14 • NUMBER 2

OCTOBER, 1965

## *Junior College Libraries*

CHARLES L. TRINKNER

*Issue Editor*

### CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

CHARLES L. TRINKNER . . . . .	119
Introduction	
PATTY ALMY . . . . .	123
Background and Development of the Junior College Library	
ALICE B. GRIFFITH . . . . .	132
Organization and Administration of the Junior College Library	
FRITZ VEIT . . . . .	145
Personnel for Junior College Libraries	
HUMPHREY A. OLSEN . . . . .	156
Building the Book Collection	
JAMES W. PIRIE . . . . .	166
Junior College Library Processing	
J. P. VAGT . . . . .	174
Readers' Services	
W. WILEY SCOTT . . . . .	183
The Library's Place in the Junior College	
FELIX E. HIRSCH . . . . .	191
Evaluation Trends	
JOHN F. HARVEY . . . . .	203
Building and Equipment Trends: I	
LLOYD R. DE GARMO . . . . .	209
Building and Equipment Trends: II	
HELEN WHEELER . . . . .	216
Appendix: A Summary of <i>The Community College Library:</i> <i>A Plan for Action</i>	

This Page Intentionally Left Blank



# Introduction

CHARLES L. TRINKNER

THIS ISSUE of *Library Trends* is devoted to contemporary trends in junior college libraries. It represents the first major attempt on the part of several writers to provide an insight to the challenging prospects and practical issues of today's junior college library.

Junior college libraries are beginning to receive the recognition and emphasis that they should have received over the first half of this century. Facilities have been inadequate, standards have been low or non-existent, administrators have disregarded the library at budget-making time, and there has been a dearth of junior college literature. Now, dynamic changes are underway!

In relation to growth, junior college community libraries are blazing a path of resources across the length and breadth of the United States. There is also a depth relationship in this new, unique institution and the role it is playing in the nation's educational system. The growth of the junior college movement is one of the greatest educational advances made in the history of higher education in America. Pressures from a rapidly-changing society, combined with a rapidly-expanding, college-age population, will catapult this country into a critical period of community college expansion. There will soon be 1,000 of these unique, academic library centers providing service for citizens. The library service program needs not only to keep pace with the rapid growth of the community college systems, but also to gear its collection to the individual institution's curriculum offerings, adult education programs, and community needs.

The typical junior college library has three needs that are basic to the total structure of effective service, viz., a well-planned library building, adequate book-collection resources, and a professional staff.

New, individual library buildings of modern design are being constructed on junior college campuses. Some additions and renovations

Mr. Trinkner is Librarian, Pensacola Junior College, Pensacola, Florida.

to existing plants have added needed space for readers, storage, and instructional resources. In contrast to the past concept of locating library quarters in some part of the administration building or classroom building, the library has reached the phase of having an individual, well-planned building, designed as a campus center. With this transition in library physical facilities, book collections can be moved from temporary and makeshift arrangements to a permanent site. Some institutions locate the library building in an isolated corner of the campus, away from the main learning activity. Random building programs have now been replaced by master-plan development, locating the library-instructional resources' edifice centrally to the classroom buildings. Physical education facilities and music programs are in planned zones, eliminating noise interference with classroom-library-learning facilities. An area approach to master planning places the student center, dining facilities, and dormitories in a separate area away from the instructional-learning portion of the campus.

Because the presentation of building and equipment trends in junior colleges is a difficult subject about which to write, we are fortunate to be able to include two articles on the subject in this issue of *Library Trends*. John F. Harvey, Dean, Graduate School of Library Science, Drexel Institute of Technology, and Lloyd R. De Garmo, Librarian, Compton (Calif.) College, the authors, present views from different parts of the country.

It is quite obvious to observers that individual junior colleges vary greatly in the strength of their resources. Resources are particularly vital to the community college library program. It is quite true that the junior college need not be a great research center; however, most librarians at all levels of education will agree that a library's holdings determine its ability to provide effective service. Greater concern for book resources has been manifested in recent years. Felix Hirsch's recent research on evaluation (findings which are included in a chapter in this issue) provides a picture of the changes occurring in the standards for the junior college library collection. The present standards have a 20,000 volume minimum. More and more emphasis will be placed on strengthening library resources and providing a balance of materials, which in turn is based on the unique aims and objectives of the junior college program. It is strongly stressed that the 20,000 volume minimum be available to the student body on the opening day of any junior college.

Library progress has led to improved and professionally stronger



## *Introduction*

library staffs holding faculty status. Professional personnel, television technicians, and clerical workers are being added to the library-instructional resources centers. The community college librarian must be an active, aggressive, dynamic, and resourceful person with the ability to undertake all of the duties of the specialized librarians of larger institutions. The world of junior college librarianship is on the brink of a new frontier. In the hands of its librarians will be placed machines with built-in memory and experience data, computers capable of making thousands of decisions each minute, instruments that will free librarians from everyday routine and provide them with the time to manage the new resources and create others. Librarians can be tomorrow's frontiersmen. Not everybody can brave this new frontier, but many can and will become creative and develop a sense of mission and dedication.


The ideal junior college library of the mid-twentieth century is building an image of its own. A significant trend is the emerging image of providing housing for all types of educational material and equipment. A new concept is beginning to appear in which the library will be organized as an instructional resources center. Not only book resources, but records, tapes, microfilms, television media, etc., will be available. Controlled "open" stacks, small partially enclosed rooms containing four to eight carrels along with lockers for ten to twenty students, are in tomorrow's plans. Electronic equipment will make it possible to transmit sounds and images any distance to the classroom, the laboratory, and to a student's residence by dialing and electronically receiving the research material needed. Whereas Mark Hopkins or someone else used to be on one end of the log and a passive student on the other, now an outstanding teacher is on one end of the coaxial cable and several hundred students are on the other. Dramatic examples of extending the junior college library from a nucleus out to the entire community are to be found in the establishment of multi-county television centers. New designs and new concepts of utilization of library facilities place the library as the focal point of the campus and as the center of the area's cultural life.

Literature on the junior college library program has been a motivating force for the advancement of junior college libraries. Librarians are moving toward more explicit recognition of the problems peculiar to the junior college library through research, periodical articles, books, and survey studies. A junior college library series is being developed for the purpose of helping librarians build, equip, and operate



CHARLES L. TRINKNER

better junior college libraries. A solid core of literature and research material will give the library schools a better opportunity to organize courses, workshops, etc., around the junior college library program. Clearly, the extent of junior college library information and knowledge is extensive and promises to become even greater.



## Background and Development of the Junior College Library

PATTY ALMY

THE EXPLOSION of junior colleges upon the educational scene has produced a fragmented philosophy in junior college libraries. A typical librarian in a junior college cannot decide whether to be a pragmatist officially (although most are in fact) or to be an instrumentalist and change philosophies as each junior college goes its own individual way. Usually librarians are too occupied to give much thought to it, since many are kept busy just keeping up with the mushrooming expansion of junior colleges.

In the scholarly journals of today, in the popular magazines, and in the state legislatures, the big discovery of the age of education for all Americans is the junior college. Many tend to think that junior colleges arose at this time and in this place to solve the educational gap of the nation. In point of fact, they have been with us for over half-a-century. And America can honestly say that the junior college is “. . . the only educational institution which can be truly stamped ‘Made in the United States of America.’”<sup>1</sup>

In the latter part of the nineteenth century, some visionary educators discussed the establishment of this type of institution. They experimented intellectually with the idea of the German *gymnasium*, which would extend the high schools to the thirteenth and fourteenth grades, after which a student could embark on university work.<sup>2</sup>

This theory was known in early circles as “university amputation.”<sup>3</sup> The reasoning was that it was better for universities to concentrate only upon higher academic work and raise accordingly their courses, standards, and requirements. Although some systems did this, it was not overwhelmingly accepted since the consensus has been that any four-year college wants to stay a four-year college, or even become a university. The next idea to appear was “high school elongation.”<sup>3</sup>

The author is Librarian, Georgia Military College, Milledgeville, Georgia.

This developed from the fact that many students were losing the chance for higher education through distance or lack of money, and that the added two years would at least give them an opportunity to pursue studies. This idea caught on quite readily. Many towns wanted to offer more advanced education, use the high school facilities, and academically advance their citizens. Today there are still many junior colleges combined with high schools as an elongation of their program.

The third concept was "college decapitation."<sup>3</sup> This was a beautiful theory but did not work well in practice. The premise was to cut off the junior and senior years in weak four-year colleges and thereby create strong two-year colleges. Since most four-year colleges want to remain four-year colleges, the idea was never cheerfully accepted by those involved, and little was done to carry out this thesis.

The final and latest idea was the "independent creation,"<sup>3</sup> which was envisioned as a two-year college, separate from a high school or a senior college, arising on its own and becoming a unique educational institution. Community colleges were derived from this concept.

In 1964, these ideas were updated into the following questions: "Shall the American university have its legs cut off? Shall the American four-year high school be stretched? Shall certain colleges have their heads cut off?"<sup>4</sup> Because so many junior colleges had already been created independently, or were in the process of being created, there was really no need to discuss the question, and the independent creation theory was not explored.

All things must have their beginnings, however, and this "Made-in-America" college invention actually began in 1892. William Rainey Harper, president of the University of Chicago, is now known as the ". . . father of the junior college."<sup>5</sup> He grasped the idea, decided it had merit, and divided his college into two schools of two years each. The lower two years were the "Academic College," and the upper two were the "University College."<sup>5</sup> However, since the names were pretentious and since in that day there were college-jargon specialists in the academic halls, the term "junior college" came into usage in 1896 at Chicago, and has been used there and elsewhere from that time.<sup>5</sup>

This junior college of that era as today offered an Associate of Arts degree. Rainey so systematically developed the program that some of his best ideas are still in practice. Under his leadership a public junior college was set up in Joliet, Illinois, and, according to the literature,

### *Background and Development of the Junior College Library*

"Joliet Junior College, established in 1902, is now the oldest public junior college in America."<sup>6</sup>

The question might well be asked, what exactly is a junior college and what factors caused it to grow? In 1926, Monroe's *A Cyclopedia of Education* stated it this way:

JUNIOR COLLEGE.—A term used by the University of Chicago, the University of California, and a few other institutions of higher learning to designate that part of the four-years' college course embraced in the freshman and sophomore years . . . to make a separation between what is pure college work and what is the beginning of university work. . . .<sup>7</sup>

The original meaning of junior college given by Monroe remains, but it has since had various facets evolve from the core of its idea. Today the junior college may encompass a variety of objectives, and the Associate in Arts degree may mean many things to many people. It may take the place of the first two years of college work, termed "two-year" or "transitional" and heavily laced with liberal arts and general education. It may be a "terminal," or a "vocational training" college, which can give people the education for jobs that a high school degree would not afford them. Or it may be in the "community" concept, sometimes known as "open-door," which in a given area enrolls free-of-charge those students of scholastic ability, and in addition provides continuing education and culture for community citizens between the ages of eighteen and eighty. This concept updates people in their jobs and accommodates elderly people who enjoy learning in their old age, or those who simply like to go to school and take advantage of its cultural and academic atmosphere. To summarize, the programs of junior colleges may be divided into three categories: (1) transfer, (2) occupational, and (3) continuing education for adults.<sup>8</sup>

The changes in American life which led to the burgeoning of junior colleges have been summed up by Michael Brick in *Forum and Focus for the Junior College Movement*:

From the struggles to achieve equality of opportunity and to broaden the scope of higher education, the junior college idea was born. The idea took root in the soil of America's cultural, economic, and political heritage. It fed and grew on such concepts as equal opportunity for all and the desire to eliminate financial, geographical, and social barriers to higher education.<sup>9</sup> . . . Four basic social and economic

forces led to the junior college idea: (1) equality of opportunity, (2) use of education to achieve social mobility, (3) technological progress, and (4) acceptance of the concept that education is the producer of social capital.<sup>10</sup>

One could even go so far as to draw an analogy between the land grant colleges and the junior colleges: the land grant colleges came into being to develop the physical resources of our country. The junior college has come into being to develop our people.

The philosophy of junior colleges is a many-tined premise. Since they now encompass, as nearly as possible, education for all, some try to be all things to all men. The two-year parallel, the adult education, the terminal, and the technological-vocational types all, to some degree, travel different paths. Although their aims are different, their bedrock basic program is generally the same. From being an institution that only educated for the first two college years with the lofty expectation of sending all of its students on to higher degrees and better lives, the junior college has now taken upon itself the following jobs:

1. The junior college is assuming sharply increased responsibility for preparing students for upper division work at universities and other senior institutions.

2. The junior college is assuming major responsibility for technical-vocational education.

3. The junior college as an essential part of its program provides general education.

4. The junior college emphasizes the education of adults.

5. The junior college is an "open-door" college.

6. Guidance is recognized as an important responsibility and, some would assert, goal of the junior college.

7. . . . [the] aim [is] to locate junior colleges within commuting distance of all students.

8. The junior college is a community college.<sup>11</sup>

Therefore, with an educational institution that branches off in all directions, what happens to its library? It is a sad but true statement that there is little in the literature concerning junior college libraries. Although reams of material are available on junior colleges, their libraries usually go unheralded and even unmentioned.

Until a definitive work clarifies the subject, it will have to be assumed that the junior college library has more or less followed the pattern of the institution it inhabits. It has robustly prospered or anemically survived according to the school it serves.

### *Background and Development of the Junior College Library*

Sparse and meager as the literature may be on the history of the junior college library, some light is thrown on the subject by Eells, who in 1931 said in *The Junior College*:

The junior college library has not received the recognition and emphasis that it merits in most of the institutions of the country. Standards have been low, actuality has been lower, facilities have been inadequate, administrators have slighted it when budgets were made, and investigators have usually ignored it in published studies.<sup>12</sup>

This is still true of the literature today. As late as 1958, Morrison and Martorana in their surveys of junior colleges said:

The area found to be most neglected was that of the junior college library. This is an observation which merits special notice by interested persons in view of the contention often heard that the junior college library has an especially important function to perform in relation to the total role of the college's community services.<sup>13</sup>

Indeed, there was and is virgin territory to explore in research on junior college libraries.

As for the standards of junior college libraries in past years, Eells said that ". . . the library should be the heart of the institution . . ." <sup>14</sup> and E. B. Ratcliffe said that "a college should have a live, well-distributed, professionally administered library of at least 8000 [depending on the accrediting area] volumes, exclusive of public documents. . . ." <sup>15</sup> Eells also reported that during 1928-29, as reported by fourteen out of sixteen junior colleges in Texas, the amount spent on the purchase of books varied from \$250 to \$5152, the latter figure representing the initial purchase for a new institution at San Angelo. The median figure was \$500. The average number of volumes in these libraries was 2873. . . . Only one library was open in the evenings and that was only one night per week.<sup>16</sup>

Contrast that with the 1960 *ALA Standards for Junior College Libraries*. While the idea that the library is the "heart" of the school is not definitely stated, it is implied and is undoubtedly part of the creed of most junior college librarians. It adds, "it must have a rich and up-to-date collection of books, periodicals, recordings, and other educational materials necessary for inspiring teaching."<sup>17</sup> For a two-year institution of up to 1,000 students (full-time equivalent), it recommends a goal of 20,000 <sup>18</sup> volumes with an annual budget of five per cent of the total educational and general budget.<sup>19</sup> This is a far cry from the \$500 mean in years gone by. And to contrast even

further, most libraries are closed only one night a week and are open the other six.

Things have changed on the junior college scene. From an almost misbegotten brain child, the institution and its library have evolved into full-fledged adolescence. As junior colleges and their libraries become adult, a philosophy is needed. It is in this area that the literature is bare. One can find discussions of automated libraries, reference services, administration, planning, book selection, and learning materials centers. But the papers on library philosophy leave the indexes starkly white with few listings. Supposedly as the college went, so went the library, or in rare cases vice versa. This, in turn, left the librarian with no firm operating system to follow, with no point of departure other than running a library in the usual way that a library functions.

Wise was the observation by a junior college librarian: "Junior-college librarians seem to be in a kind of class to themselves. They are "'twixt an' 'tweens. . . ." <sup>20</sup>

And they are. Junior college librarians are neither high school nor senior college—they are in between. Junior colleges are breaking out like measles all over the country; they now number over 700.<sup>21</sup> And with one out of every four students who enter college entering junior colleges (they now enroll over 800,000,<sup>22</sup> and the prediction for the future is still greater), it is perhaps time for the junior college librarian to adopt a philosophy to serve as a buttress in any type of junior college library, two-year parallel, terminal, vocational, church-related, community, private, or any of the terms yet to be invented. The job is too big to be dismissed with the conclusion: "Well, we're transitional and we'll operate this way until something better comes along."

After thought, reading, research, and personal experience in the problem of being a junior college librarian, it is believed that this type of library can only be preparatory—not high school preparatory, but certainly not on a senior college or research level. After all, with the emphasis on the guidance of students into the proper college and career, with the responsibility for preparing terminal students with continuing self-education through library use, with the task of providing stimulating library materials for elder citizens (and the general community as well) and preparing them for learned leisure—the true job of the junior college librarian is preparation.

Therefore, from extensive research arises a proposal for a new philosophy for junior college libraries, for these "made-in-America" edu-



### *Background and Development of the Junior College Library*

cational institutions a "made-in-America" philosophy—"preparation through reading" or "paralegism." This is derived from the Latin *parare* (to prepare) plus *legundo* (reading). It is possible that this philosophy may define the role of junior college libraries and the varied types of institutions they serve.

The years will pass, and the debate will continue as to the role of junior colleges on the American educational scene. No one can accurately foretell how large the junior college complex will grow in the coming years—all that is known is that it will grow. No one can foretell how the educational conflict as to what a junior college actually is will end; all that is known is that the outcome will result in better education. And as junior colleges grow, and the educational product improves, much will depend on the libraries of each separate and unique institution. The trend at present seems to be toward community colleges, and it is a trend that shows no signs of abating. Undoubtedly the church-related, the private, and the independent junior colleges will have their roles—but the community college appears dominant in this segment of American education.

Edwin J. Gleazer, Jr., executive director of the American Association of Junior Colleges, has said:

I am sure of this much: Junior colleges will be called up to carry a large responsibility in meeting the higher education needs of our nation in the years ahead. This genuine American invention, the junior college, is uniquely suited for this responsibility and it may be relied upon to do its part.<sup>23</sup>

Through the use of "paralegism"—preparation through reading—the junior college libraries may be relied upon to help the junior colleges close America's educational gap.

### *References*

1. Gleazer, Edmund J., Jr. *Junior Colleges: An Introduction*. Washington, D.C., American Council on Education, 1963, p. 4.
2. Gleazer, Edmund J., Jr. "The Rise of the Junior College from High School Extension to Higher Education," *College and University Business*, 37:64, Oct. 1964.
3. Eells, Walter Crosby. *The Junior College*. Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1931, p. 44.
4. Brick, Michael. *Forum and Focus for the Junior College Movement*. (The American Association of Junior Colleges.) New York, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964, p. 22.
5. Eells, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

PATTY ALMY


6. *Ibid.*, p. 54.
7. Monroe, Paul, ed. *A Cyclopedia of Education*. New York, The MacMillan Co., 1926, Vol. 3, p. 573.
8. Gleazer, Edmund J., Jr. "Junior Colleges Grow Up Professionally—and Out—Vocationally," *College and University Business*, 37:63, Nov. 1964.
9. Brick, *op. cit.*, p. 26.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 2.
11. *Technical-Vocational Education and the Community College*. Proceedings of the Thirteenth Annual Legislative Work Conference of the Southern Regional Education Board, Williamsburg, Virginia, 1964, pp. 9-13.
12. Eells, *op. cit.*, p. 443.
13. Morrison, D. G., and Martorana, S. V. *The 2-Year Community College—An Annotated List of Studies and Surveys*. (United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Bulletin No. 14). Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1958, p. 3.
14. Eells, *op. cit.*, p. 445.
15. Ratcliffe, E. B. *Accredited Higher Institutions*. (United States Bureau of Education, Bulletin No. 10). Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1926, p. 6.
16. Eells, *op. cit.* p. 450.
17. *ALA Standards for Junior College Libraries*. Chicago, The Association of College and Research Libraries, 1960, p. 200.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 203.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 201.
20. Gray, Macy Bishop. "Junior-College Librarians," *School and Society*, 63: 211, March 23, 1946.
21. Gleazer, *Junior Colleges: An Introduction*, *op. cit.*, p. 3.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 4.
23. Gleazer, Edmund J., Jr. "Junior Colleges Will Expand in Importance As Well As Numbers," *College and University Business*, 37:46, Dec. 1964.

ADDITIONAL REFERENCES

- American Association of Junior Colleges. *The Privately Supported Junior Colleges: A Place and Purpose in Higher Education*. Washington, American Association of Junior Colleges, 1963.
- Anderson, John E. "Research in the Junior College: Anathema or Anodyne," *Junior College Journal*, 35:15-16, Nov. 1964.
- "College, J. G.," *Newsweek*, 63:108-109, April 20, 1964.
- Harris, Norman C. *Technical Education in the Junior College: New Programs for New Jobs*. Washington, American Association of Junior Colleges, 1964.
- Hechinger, Fred M. "The Flowering of a Campus Hybrid," *New York Times Magazine*, Sept. 13, 1964, pp. 36-37+. [Reprinted by American Association of Junior Colleges.]
- Hirsch, Felix E. "New Horizons for Junior College Libraries," In Charles L. Trinkner, ed., *Better Libraries Make Better Schools*, Hamden, Conn., Shoe String Press, 1962, pp. 73-78.
- Johnson, B. Lamar. "Institutional Research in Western Junior Colleges," *Junior College Journal*, 32:370-379, March 1962.

### *Background and Development of the Junior College Library*

- Johnson, B. Lamar. *Starting A Community Junior College*. Washington, American Association of Junior Colleges, 1964.
- Merlo, Frank P. "The Burgeoning Community College: Higher Education for All?" *Saturday Review*, 47:52-66, Dec. 19, 1964.
- Schwartz, Bert. "The Burgeoning Community College: Is It Really Higher Education?" *Saturday Review*, 47:52-66, Dec. 19, 1964.
- "Why Junior Colleges Are Increasing," *Good Housekeeping*, 158:156, March 1964.



# Organization and Administration of the Junior College Library

ALICE B. GRIFFITH

THERE IS AN ABUNDANCE of literature on administration and organization in business and industry, a sizeable body of literature on libraries in general, but literature on the junior college library is very scant. Therefore, in order to investigate the organization and administration of junior college libraries, it is necessary to study general principles of management and approved practices in other types of libraries. It is also helpful to examine the statistical reports of junior college libraries in terms of resources, staff, and operating expenditures so that a clear picture of the type of library under discussion can be presented. In addition to the literature available on administration and organization, current junior college library practices in these areas can be assessed through the use of questionnaires.

The above methods were employed in preparing this paper which attempts to review principles of sound administration, to show how junior college libraries are being organized and administered, and to emphasize apparent trends in junior college library administration. The libraries under consideration are those in both private and public institutions, libraries serving fewer than 100 students in small private colleges, and libraries meeting the needs of thousands of students in the public community colleges.

John Harvey observed that many junior college libraries are too small, with poor physical facilities, poor staff, poor book collections, inadequate budgets, and are in need of better organization.<sup>1</sup> Helen Wheeler summarized a questionnaire she circulated in preparing her doctoral dissertation and found that the area of greatest inadequacy in community college libraries are staff, collection, and physical facilities.<sup>2</sup>

---

The author is Library Director, Mohawk Valley Community College, Utica, New York.

## *Organization and Administration of the Junior College Library*

In support of the quantitative aspects of both Harvey's observations and Wheeler's report, an analysis of the 1962/63 *Library Statistics of Colleges and Universities*<sup>3</sup> was made and the results are shown in Table 1; 78 per cent of the libraries have 20,000 or fewer volumes; 87 per cent of the libraries reporting have 300 or fewer periodical subscriptions; 82 per cent of the libraries reporting have 2, 1, or 0 professional librarians on the staff; 85 per cent of the libraries reporting have 2, 1, or 0 non-professional staff members; and 73 per cent of the libraries reporting have total operating budgets of \$30,000 or less.

### TABLE I

*Analysis of Information on 486 Junior College Libraries Reported in Library Statistics of Colleges and Universities, 1962-63*

<i>Enrollment</i>	<i>Volumes</i>	<i>Periodicals</i>	<i>Professional Librarians</i>	<i>Clerical Staff</i>	<i>Total Operating Expenditures</i>
Under 500 51.1%	Under 5,000 13.6%	Under 50 7.8%	0 4%	0 30.2%	Under \$10,000 28.8%
500-1,000 19.3%	5,000-10,000 24%	50-100 28.6%	1 56.8%	1 39.9%	\$ 10,000-\$ 20,000 31.7%
1,000-2,000 12.8%	10,000-20,000 40%	100-200 38.1%	2 20.8%	2 14.6%	\$ 20,000-\$ 30,000 12.6%
2,000-3,000 5.2%	20,000-30,000 13.4%	200-300 12.7%	3 10.4%	3 5.6%	\$ 30,000-\$ 40,000 8%
3,000-4,000 3.1%	30,000-40,000 4.2%	300-400 5.7%	4 3.4%	4 2.8%	\$ 40,000-\$ 50,000 4.7%
4,000-5,000 1.9%	40,000-50,000 1.6%	400-500 2.9%	5 1.9%	5 3%	\$ 50,000-\$100,000 10.6%
5,000-6,000 1.7%	50,000-60,000 .8%	Over 500 4%	6 .6%	6 1.8%	\$100,000-\$200,000 2.7%
Over 6,000 5%	Over 60,000 2.5%		Over 6 1.8%	Over 6 2.1%	Over \$200,000 .8%

If the statistical information is used as a guide, it can be seen that over 50 per cent of junior college libraries serve colleges with enrollments of less than 500, have book collections under the recommended standard of 20,000 volumes,<sup>4</sup> subscribe to less than 300 periodicals, are staffed with one professional librarian who has one or no clerical assistant, and operate on less than \$20,000 per year for total expenditures. It is also evident, of course, that a few junior college libraries

have large enrollments, exceed 60,000 volumes in the book collection, employ comparatively large staffs, and spend a considerable sum of money each year.

The problems of organization and administration of these libraries may be divided into two categories: those affecting the small library and those applicable to the large and growing library. Edward Heiliger pointed out in an earlier issue of *Library Trends* that ". . . in administrative matters small libraries differ from large libraries only in the manner and degree of applying administrative elements and principles."<sup>5</sup> It may be assumed that the characteristically small size of most junior college libraries determines how they are administered and the administrative problems which exist.

Components of administration include policy-making, budgeting, organizing, and staffing. Policy in the junior college library may well be in the process of development, but should cover, according to Guy R. Lyle, (1) relationship of librarian to higher authority, (2) control of library resources, (3) library committee, and (4) library staff.<sup>6</sup>

A questionnaire concerning library policy was sent to 100 junior college librarians, including those in both public and private colleges. An attempt was made to select libraries with a collection of at least 10,000 volumes and a staff of more than one. Sixty-four responses were received from the questionnaire. Of these, twenty-nine reported having a written statement of library policy while thirty-five did not.

William Nash defines library policy as a ". . . predetermined course of action or guide to future action."<sup>7</sup> It is self-evident that no matter how small the library, decisions concerning present operation or future growth cannot easily be made unless a well-defined policy exists. The writing of policy involves a consideration of the philosophy and objectives of the library as well as of the particular college of which the library is a part. Therefore, junior college library policy would understandably be influenced by the size of the college, the nature of the college (whether public or private), the size of the library, and library goals.

Since policy reflects the librarian's relation to the president and the dean, one item in the questionnaire sought information about this relationship. In thirty-two colleges the librarian is directly responsible to the president, while in thirty colleges the librarian is responsible to the president through the dean of instruction or an academic vice-president. (Two librarians did not answer this question.) Lyle has stated that it is becoming quite common for the librarian to be re-

### *Organization and Administration of the Junior College Library*

sponsible to the president through an academic vice-president or dean.<sup>8</sup> The results from the questionnaire show this trend is apparent in the two-year as well as the four-year college.

Ordinarily the president appoints the librarian, informs him of his academic status, and expects him to carry out the educational policies of the institution. The librarian will, in all likelihood, be asked to prepare a budget and an annual report and will keep the president informed of changes, additions, and needs. The dean of instruction will advise the librarian of curricular changes which will enable him to work with the faculty in securing recommendations for additions to the materials collection.<sup>9</sup>

In the very small junior college library with one professional staff member, the librarian has opportunity to work informally and directly with administration and faculty. The librarian in this situation will formulate policy without the benefit of suggestions from other staff members. It is then to his advantage to attend library meetings and conferences in order to exchange ideas with other members of his profession. In the questionnaire to which reference was previously made, sixty of the sixty-four librarians reported membership in professional organizations. This large percentage seems to indicate the awareness of the value of such professional association by the junior college library administrator.

Policy also will pertain to the nature of library materials, and their control. The above mentioned questionnaire showed that eight libraries had written statements of policy concerning acquisitions and eighteen had written policy concerning circulation and control of library materials. It is important to distinguish between policy and rules or regulations when thinking about purchase, circulation, and control. Policy explains purpose and function, and does not include detailed regulations.<sup>10</sup> In this case, policy might list the types of library materials such as books, magazines, pamphlets, phonograph records, films, etc., but would not list the procedures for the purchase and cataloging of these materials. Similarly policy may state the general guidelines for the purchasing of duplicates for the reserve book section, but will not include the rules governing the use of reserve materials.

The library committee which serves as a liaison group between the faculty and the librarian advises the latter on matters of library policy. According to the responses to the questionnaire, a library committee exists in fifty-four of the sixty-four colleges reporting. The committee



participates in policy making in forty-four of the libraries. From this sample there is ample evidence that junior college librarians do have the advice of a faculty group in matters such as allocation of funds within the library budget, treatment of rare books, purchase of duplicates, planning renovations or new buildings, and many others.

The final area of library policy relates to staff. Responses to the questionnaire indicated that most colleges had a written policy which covered appointment and academic status of the library staff. In many colleges the librarian recommends candidates for professional positions to the president, but clerical staff are supplied from civil service lists. Fifty-three of the librarians answering the questionnaire indicated that the administration participated in the selection of library staff.

Responses to the questionnaire also indicated that the library staff participated in the formulation of library policy in fifty-two libraries. Twenty-nine of the librarians hold regular staff meetings. Staff are advised of revisions in library policy by written memoranda (23), meetings (25), both (14), and by other means (14). Twenty-four of the sixty-four librarians reported that they had a staff manual. The use of staff manuals and the need for staff meetings is, of course, dependent upon the size of the staff.

In the larger library, staff members will become cognizant of areas for which policy needs to be written or revised and will assist in the formulation of such policy. As contrasted to the director of the smaller library, the administrator of the larger library will work formally through committees, representatives of the college president, and heads of departments within his library in establishing guidelines for the administration of the library.

It is not necessary to detail here specific examples of library policy currently in effect in junior colleges. Just as each college has its own distinctive personality, so does each college library. Policy that is successful in one library may not be appropriate in another. However, each library should develop its own policy, preferably in written form.

Another area in the administration of the junior college library relates to budgeting and financial affairs. Through budgeting the librarian is able to plan for the future and make library needs known to the administration. In order to secure information about existing relationships between libraries and business offices and to assess the role of budgeting in two-year college libraries, a questionnaire was circulated to 100 librarians. (This was the same sample surveyed by the library policy questionnaire.)

### *Organization and Administration of the Junior College Library*

Sixty-four responded to the second questionnaire. Of those who replied, only seven reported that they did not prepare an annual budget. Those items budgeted by the greatest number were books (60), periodicals (59), binding (57), and equipment (44). Twenty-four of the librarians included travel and supplies in their budgets, while thirty-six budgeted for personnel, twelve for audio-visual materials, and two for maintenance of building.

Ten replied that funds not spent during a given budget period could be carried over to the next budget period. Twenty stated that the administration can withdraw funds after the budget has been approved for a given year.

Thirty-two librarians do not allocate funds by department within the library budget, while twenty-seven do. When departmental allocation is done, twelve use a formula, fourteen rely upon the advice of the library committee, and one uses a combination of these procedures. In twenty-one of the libraries, accounts for these allocated funds are kept by the library.

A description of the procedures used for setting up departmental allocations within a junior college library budget has been written by Norman Tanis at Henry Ford Community College, Dearborn, Mich.<sup>11</sup> Tanis includes a discussion of the various factors affecting the determination of amounts allocated to each department, including library holdings in specific fields, publication rates in different subject areas, per volume cost of books in different fields, and the necessity for updating the collection in a specific subject area. The size and nature of college departments and their record of participation in book selection and in stimulating use of library materials also influence the pattern of allocations. Tanis reports several advantages resulting from the change to a library budget in which book funds are allocated by department. Among these are increased faculty interest in library purchases, greater understanding on the part of the administration of the way library monies are spent, and a better book collection.

The small junior college library may find departmental allocation impractical since departments are few and the funds to divide are scarce. However, the large and growing library finds the system of allocations, which is generally used in the four-year college library, an efficient way of insuring balance in departmental spending.

Further results of the questionnaire show that the business office carries from 0 to 38 separate accounts for the libraries represented, with 1 to 8 accounts most often reported. In the majority of cases all

library purchases have to be made through the business office although eleven librarians reported that only equipment had to be purchased this way. Fifteen libraries indicated that purchasing was done through a central agency.

Twenty libraries have funds for book purchases other than those in the current operating budget. Only two reported that spending could not be done throughout the budget period. In thirty colleges, teaching departments may order books without involving the library; in thirty-two colleges, this cannot be done. Only four librarians stated that they were not satisfied with the library's relation to the business office in their colleges.

Responses to the questionnaire show that, in general, junior college librarians are requested to submit an annual budget. This important responsibility gives the librarian opportunity for planning the growth of the library. Since many junior colleges are rapidly expanding, the librarians in these colleges must plan for the purchase of additional materials to meet the needs of increased enrollment and curricular offerings, to budget additional staff positions for improved service, and to request monies for building programs.

In addition to policy-making and budgeting, the administrator must concern himself with organization. Organization has been defined by Louis Allen as the "process of identifying and grouping the work to be performed, defining and delegating responsibility and authority, and establishing relationships for the purpose of enabling people to work most effectively together in accomplishing objectives."<sup>12</sup> Or more concisely the manager (or administrator) gets work done through other people by organizing, assigning work, supervising, coordinating, teaching, and helping people develop their capacity to work.<sup>13</sup>

The junior college librarian who is the sole staff member cannot apply the principles of organization insofar as they involve other people. But when he is responsible for all types of library work, the work itself will have to be organized and scheduled, or it will not be done efficiently. If clerical assistance, including students who work part-time, is available, the librarian should examine the division of labor to make certain that he is relieved of the bulk of non-professional duties.

Inherent in organization is the division of work which should occur according to plan and not merely by individual staff preferences. Library work may be divided into administrative duties, selection and

### *Organization and Administration of the Junior College Library*

acquisition of library materials, preparation of materials, and assistance to readers.<sup>14</sup> In the larger libraries, such divisions result in the formation of departments.

When there is one professional library staff member, he is concerned primarily with the acquisition and processing of materials. There is little time for assistance to readers, and administrative duties, although not complex, are minimized. In libraries with two professional staff members, one is often responsible for technical processes while the other is responsible for reader services. In practice, however, many combinations of responsibilities are made. In addition, one librarian must assume administrative duties.

Not until the library staff expands to a minimum of three professionals (with a corresponding increase in clerical assistants) can the library director perform truly administrative duties. He is then freed of the many details related to ordering, cataloging, and circulation, and has time to study library use, to work to a greater extent with faculty and administration, to plan the development of the library, and to analyze the progress made in library affairs. As can be seen by the statistics previously reported, only a small percentage of junior college librarians are in situations where they can be full-time administrators.

In surveying the organization of some of the larger libraries, it is found that as the size of staff increases, staff members are made responsible for smaller segments of work such as cataloging, periodicals, audio-visual services, ordering, reference, circulation, etc. With large staffs, assistants are assigned to each division or department. The assistants are then, of course, responsible to the department head, and the heads of reference, cataloging, and other departments report to the librarian.

In organizing the work to be done and establishing lines of authority, it is helpful to prepare an organization chart and to write job descriptions. Many general texts on administrative organization provide guides to the making of such charts. Job descriptions should be written so that they do not need to be redone each time a position is filled. Confusion and dissatisfaction result when clear-cut job descriptions do not exist and when lines of authority are vague.

Since the junior college library staff is usually small, it is important that the administrative organization fosters good team work and develops *esprit de corps*. Although division of duties is necessary to organization, it is equally necessary that each staff member's work be

integrated into one effort.<sup>15</sup> Staff relationships are generally informal, but with a staff of more than two, communication techniques tend to be overlooked. Uninformed staff cannot contribute effectively to the library's objectives.

One of the basic elements of executive (or administrative) action is communication.<sup>16</sup> The librarian should strive to improve communication with staff (whether professional, clerical, or student assistant), with administration, with faculty, and with students so that the work gets done and there is understanding of what is to be done and comprehension of the reason for its being done. "The administration of any organization can be accomplished only through communication. The effectiveness of administrative communication within an organization is, therefore, the best measure of the effectiveness of the administration of that organization."<sup>17</sup> The librarian has opportunity to communicate with his staff through meetings, procedure manuals, memoranda, individual conferences, informal conversations, etc. It has been noted earlier that many librarians make use of various communication techniques in keeping their staff advised of policy changes and other matters.

Another factor in junior college library administration is staffing. Although many libraries do not have large staffs for selection and training, even the smallest library must be staffed. The head librarian has many duties to perform and must be well acquainted with all types of library work. In the small college he is frequently called upon to do a variety of professional and clerical tasks, and he must be as proficient in reader services as he is in technical processes. Even in the larger library, emergencies may develop which require him to act temporarily as cataloger, reference librarian, or audio-visual specialist. In addition he must work with the administration, faculty, and students of the college, and he is responsible for the selection and supervision of clerical assistants.

One of the librarian's most important responsibilities is the selection of library staff. He must find those who are qualified and competent, who can get along well with other people, and who are willing to take on additional assignments when required. Staff members will be expected at times to work under pressure and frequently will have to adapt to changing needs as the library develops.

Fritz Veit, director of Libraries at Chicago Teachers College and Chicago Junior College (Wilson Branch), and Ray Rowland, librarian at Augusta College, Augusta, Ga., have investigated the staffing of

### *Organization and Administration of the Junior College Library*

junior college libraries.<sup>18</sup> Veit reports that in nearly all the colleges surveyed the head librarian had faculty status and in the majority of the libraries that had more than one professional staff member, the other professional librarians also had faculty status. Faculty status may be interpreted to mean that librarians are included in the faculty salary scale, have the same holidays, are assigned an academic rank, are eligible for sabbaticals, and are appointed to faculty committees. Although there is not a large percentage of junior colleges which use academic ranking or grant sabbaticals, many that do include the librarians in the faculty group. Veit also found that on the whole junior college librarians are well-trained and have good academic backgrounds. Many have college library experience but, at the time of the survey (1962), the greatest number had formerly been associated with school libraries.

The work of the librarian in the small junior college library has been discussed earlier. In the larger library, the chief librarian must devote more time to administrative tasks and be concerned with selecting other staff members. The professional staff he selects must have professional training as well as competence in a subject field, and should have an understanding of the philosophy and goals of the junior college.

Many junior college faculty employ audio-visual aids in instruction. In colleges that subscribe to the philosophy that the library is a materials center, the audio-visual department is a portion of library service. In the public two-year colleges of New York State, this is true in about 50 per cent of the colleges. In the responses to the questionnaire on library policy to which reference was made earlier, it was found that audio-visual aids constituted a separate department in thirty-two colleges and a part of the library in thirty-two colleges. Although the standards state that additional staff and budget should be provided in junior college libraries handling the audio-visual function,<sup>19</sup> fifty-one of the respondents indicated that the library staff handled audio-visual, and forty that the audio-visual budget was part of the library budget. This would indicate that although the responding librarian considered the audio-visual department as separate from the library, the library in the majority of cases was responsible for staffing and budgeting needs.

Another area of library service presenting special problems in staffing involves the sharing of library facilities by two institutions of different academic level.<sup>20</sup> It is not infrequent that high schools and

junior colleges under the same supervisor share not only the materials collection but staff as well. A two-year college library may be combined with a four-year college library under one administrative head such as is done at the Wilson Branch of the Chicago Junior College and the Chicago Teachers College, both of which are under municipal control.

In small libraries, student assistants are frequently the entire clerical staff. Their selection and training is a never-ending process since there is rapid turnover in student employment. However, many students are capable of performing work necessary for the efficient operation of the library. A well-trained student work force is a valuable asset to any library.

A standard for the number of clerical assistants in a junior college library has not been definitively written. There have been recommendations of one clerical position for each professional position.<sup>2</sup> The support of each professional position by two clericals has also been suggested.<sup>21</sup> And in more general terms Archie McNeal has recommended that there be a higher ratio of clerical to professional staff so that there may be a separation of clerical and professional duties.<sup>22</sup>

The clerk in the small library will work with a variety of library routines. In the larger library where more clerks are available, each may be assigned to a specific area of work. Persons with clerical skills may be given on-the-job training so that typing of orders and catalog cards, working with the public at the circulation desk, handling the many details pertaining to periodicals, and many other tasks may be performed successfully. In addition to his clerical skills and knowledge of routines peculiar to library operation, the well-qualified library clerk should have a pleasing personality since the clerical assistant often represents the library to its public.

In conclusion it would be fair to say that the administration and organization of junior college libraries are patterned quite closely after the example of the four-year college library. Although many small libraries do not have the resources, staff, or funds to develop complex administrative organization, their need for better organization will develop as they grow in size. The junior college librarian is writing library policy. He is working with a library committee. He is developing sound financial and budgetary practices. As the college grows and more departments come into existence, he is becoming responsible to the chief administrator through an academic dean or dean of the



### *Organization and Administration of the Junior College Library*

faculty. He is also planning the growth of the materials collection and encouraging departmental participation in book selection by establishing departmental allocations within the library budget.

As the library staff increases, the librarian is organizing departments through division of work, preparing procedure manuals, and otherwise developing means of communication with his staff. Those junior college libraries destined to remain small will, of course, not follow the trends of greater organization, but will continue to operate on an informal basis with a minimum of complexity in their administration.

Although quantitatively junior college libraries have far to go in meeting the standards established for them, they are a part of the total library scene, and will remain as long as the two-year college continues to perform its unique function in American education. As greater dependence is placed upon the library, junior college librarians will use their training and experience to meet the constant challenge of providing better service for faculty and students. And this can only be done through improved organization and administration.

### *References*

1. Harvey, John F. "The Role of the Junior College Library in Classroom Instruction," *Junior College Journal*, 32:445-447, April 1962.
2. Wheeler, Helen. Letter dated Jan. 15, 1964. This letter includes a summary of the results of a questionnaire directed to 198 community college library directors. The questionnaire was a part of Wheeler's research in writing *The Community College Library; An Appraisal of Current Practice*, Ed.D. thesis at Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.
3. U.S. Office of Education. *Library Statistics of Colleges and Universities, 1962-63: Institutional Data*. Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1964; and U.S. Office of Education, Library Services Branch. *Supplement to Library Statistics of Colleges and Universities, 1962-63: Institutional Data of 419 Libraries*. Chicago, American Library Association, 1964.
4. Association of College and Research Libraries, Committee on Standards. "Standards for Junior College Libraries," *College and Research Libraries*, 21:201-202, May 1960.
5. Heiliger, Edward M. "Administration of Small Libraries," *Library Trends*, 7:465-471, Jan. 1959.
6. Lyle, Guy R. *The Administration of the College Library*. 3d ed. New York, The H. W. Wilson Co., 1961, p. 33.
7. Nash, William V. "Policy Making in Libraries," *Illinois Libraries*, 44:340, May 1962.
8. Lyle, *op. cit.*, p. 50.
9. Jones, Robert C. "Administrative Relationships of the Library and the Junior College," *Junior College Journal*, 29:324-328, Feb. 1959.

ALICE B. GRIFFITH

10. Carty, Jackson C. "Administration." In Charles L. Trinkner, ed. *Library Services for Junior Colleges*, Northport, Ala., American Southern Publishing Co., 1964, pp. 15-31.
11. Tanis, Norman E. "The Departmental Allocation of Library Book Funds in the Junior College: Developing Criteria," *Library Resources and Technical Services*, 5:321-327, Fall 1961.
12. Allen, Louis A. *Management and Organization*. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1958, p. 57.
13. Ewing, David W. *The Managerial Mind*. New York, The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964, pp. 194-196.
14. Lyle, *op. cit.*, pp. 48-50.
15. Pfiffner, John M. *Administrative Organization*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, 1960, p. 114.
16. Albers, Henry H. *Organized Executive Action*. New York, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1961, p. 534.
17. Thayer, Lee O. *Administrative Communication*. Homewood, Ill., Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1961, p. 3.
18. Veit, Fritz. "Personnel." In Charles L. Trinkner, ed. *Library Services for Junior Colleges*, Northport, Ala., American Southern Publishing Co., 1964, pp. 79-113.
19. Association of College and Research Libraries, *op. cit.*, p. 202.
20. Veit, *op. cit.*, p. 90.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 94.
22. McNeal, Archie L. "Ratio of Professional to Clerical Staff," *College and Research Libraries*, 17:219-223, May 1956.

# Personnel For Junior College Libraries

FRITZ VEIT

THE SIGNIFICANCE of personnel for a library program is undisputed today. Louis Wilson and Maurice Tauber, for instance, in their volume on the university library, listed "Personnel" next to "Resources for Instruction" as an element fundamental to the successful operation of a library.<sup>1</sup>

Today library staffs in institutions of higher learning—universities, senior colleges, and junior colleges—are commonly divided into three principal categories: professional, non-professional or clerical, and student assistants. The following brief account traces the development of the library staffs in junior colleges, devoting principal attention, as the literature has, to the professional category.

It is noteworthy that the first comprehensive survey of the American junior college gives only scant attention to the library. In the index to this pioneering investigation by Leonard Koos, published in 1924, are only a few references relating to the library.<sup>2</sup> The role and training of the librarian are not even mentioned. Only seven years later the library receives quite systematic consideration by Walter Eells in a textbook.<sup>3</sup> As an illustration of the rapid increase in esteem of the library, Eells compares the standards of the American Association of Junior Colleges adopted in March 1922 with the revised statement of standards of this Association adopted at Atlantic City in November 1929. The standards of 1922 required merely that a very modest book stock be maintained. The 1929 library standards of the American Association of Junior Colleges increased the book requirements, but above all provided that a trained librarian shall be in charge of the library.<sup>4</sup> This requirement, as spelled out in part of Standard X reads:

The library shall be in charge of a full-time librarian with the same qualifications and educational background as a teacher in the junior college, including from twenty-four to thirty semester hours in an approved library school or equivalent in specific training for librarianship. An adequate number of assistants shall be provided.<sup>5</sup>

Mr. Veit is Director of Libraries, Illinois Teachers College-Chicago (South) and Wilson Junior College, Chicago, Ill.

Parenthetically it may be noted that the American Association of Junior Colleges was not a "standardizing agency" except in territory where no accrediting agencies took account of the junior college. A consideration of these standards is nevertheless pertinent to the discussion since they represented the view of what should be attainable at that time.

The Carnegie Corporation which in the 1930's distributed funds to junior colleges for the acquisition of books insisted that their libraries meet some broadly outlined requirements if they wished to receive financial support. The expectations of the Carnegie Corporation were reflected in its standards.<sup>6</sup> In the personnel area, the Carnegie standards note in general terms that the librarian must be involved in the educational program and be as much concerned with educational as with administrative matters. They prescribe further that librarians be considered members of the educational staff and receive corresponding recognition in terms of salary, tenure, and advancement. The standards are not specific as to the number of librarians needed in the libraries of various sizes nor do they elaborate on distinctions between professional and non-professional staffs.

Most significant are the efforts of the junior college librarians themselves to gain recognition and professional status. The Junior College Libraries Round Table (predecessor to the Junior College Libraries Section of the Association of College and Research Libraries) was organized in 1930 and had as one of its principal objectives the development of standards for book stock, book budget, and staff. Regarding personnel, the recommended 1930 standards required two professional staff members for an institution with up to 500 students, and correspondingly larger staffs for institutions with larger enrollments, together with student help and clerical assistance. As to status, the person designated as head librarian should be equal in rank with the full professor and department head, and the other members of the professional library staff should be on par with the academic grade just below the department head, and with no less than the grade of instructor.<sup>7</sup>

These recommended standards were debated and evaluated by the library profession in succeeding years. Surveys and other studies were undertaken so that comparisons could be made between practices and desired goals. During certain periods, the movement to perfect standards and to have them adopted was strong and during other periods—such as the war years—efforts were in abeyance.<sup>8</sup> But it persisted.

### *Personnel for Junior College Libraries*

Finally in 1960 the efforts of the library profession came to fruition with the adoption of a formal set of "Standards for Junior College Libraries."<sup>9</sup>

Like the standards recommended in 1930, those adopted in 1960 list two professional staff members as the minimum number for even the small library. In the "1960 Standards for Junior College Libraries," the line between the professional and the non-professional categories is more sharply drawn, and the need for non-professional staff members is presented with greater urgency. While the 1960 standards demand that professional librarians should have faculty status and be fully involved in the educational program, they insist with equal force on the responsibility of the librarian to equip himself with a broad and general academic background in addition to his professional training.

Writers in the field of librarianship have consistently pointed to the central role that the junior college librarian must play. Ermine Stone in her pioneering volume on the junior college library—essentially an attempt to correlate the then existing literature—states that there is no other member on the faculty who must combine within himself as many qualities; he must be teacher, administrator, and bookman.<sup>10</sup> As a corollary, the librarian must be accorded academic status with the rank of full professor and department head. She notes also that a librarian must have academic training comparable to that of other (teaching) faculty members.

Stone comments on a condition which would seem very strange to us today. She deplores that sometimes there are several coordinate librarians if a staff comprises several professional members. She feels—as we commonly do today—that one person should be placed in charge of the library and be responsible for its administration.

William W. Bishop was Chairman of the Advisory Group on Junior College Libraries, of the Carnegie Corporation of New York, when in a 1935 article he described the then current situation and his future expectations.<sup>11</sup> From thorough familiarity with the junior college library field, he became convinced that the librarian "... is the one vital element in the solution of the junior college library problem..."<sup>12</sup> and that there exists the highest possible correlation between the training and personality of the junior college librarian and the efficiency in the management of the junior college library. He insisted that the person employed as a junior college librarian be professionally well-trained. Bishop recommended a course in junior college library administra-

tion as especially valuable. A note by the editor of the *Junior College Journal* shows that Bishop was as yet unaware of the fact that since 1929 such a course, open to second year students, had been offered at the University of California.

Of great significance to the junior college library field were the practices at Stephens College in Columbia, Missouri, which have been described in accounts by the president, the librarian, and various members of the faculty.<sup>13</sup> At Stephens College teachers and librarians form one single instructional staff. Librarians are heavily involved in class work and in matters of curriculum. To emphasize this unity B. Lamar Johnson, the long-time head librarian of Stephens College, was also designated by the college administration as the dean of instruction. Such an arrangement cannot leave any doubt whatever that the librarian is a teacher. After he became a professor of higher education at the University of California, Johnson advocated, as he had in earlier writings also, that the librarian's position always be a major one on the instructional staff. In a study published in 1952, he could point to many instances in which the librarian held a key position.<sup>14</sup>

The task of tracing developments and discovering trends in the junior college library personnel area is further aided by the analysis of a number of surveys. A comprehensive survey based on questionnaire returns was prepared by members of the Junior College Libraries Round Table in 1931.<sup>15</sup> Since only 30 per cent of the librarians responded and since some of these returns were partial, the findings can be only "roughly indicative" of the situation.<sup>16</sup> Noteworthy for this period was the preponderance of librarians who were attached to libraries serving both a high school and a junior college over those libraries serving junior colleges exclusively. Also significant was the professional experience of the librarians prior to appointment to junior college positions. Most librarians had had their experience in public libraries, with experience in school and college libraries ranking second and third, respectively.<sup>17</sup> The survey notes that from the available data:

. . . one may jump to the conclusion that the typical junior college librarian is a woman with an A.B. degree and some technical training, not equal to one year in an accredited library school. She has had public library experience and has held her present position four years. She has no full-time assistants, but has some unpaid part-time help. Perhaps more adequate data will brighten this picture.<sup>18</sup>

### *Personnel for Junior College Libraries*

Another survey, also based on incomplete returns, formed the basis of a book by Harlen M. Adams. This author noted that many junior colleges have been established on high school campuses and that therefore the character of their library staffs had necessarily been influenced by this situation. Adams mentions that in California, for instance, forty-nine of fifty-three librarians who submitted returns had some training in teaching and twenty-four held a general secondary teaching credential. Another comment by Adams on his findings is that the number of subprofessional assistants is decidedly limited.<sup>19</sup>

Of several surveys which are restricted to individual states, two may be singled out as indicative of the larger national picture. A 1939 report on California junior college libraries by Elizabeth Neal<sup>20</sup> stated that 73 per cent of the librarians had a bachelor's degree, a year of professional training, and two years of library experience, and that all had teacher's status. She pointed out as a situation to be corrected that the librarian was not given professional assistants but had to rely on student help.

In a report dealing with Texas junior colleges, also issued in 1939, Mary Clay noted that the librarians had the required general and professional training, but they too lacked professional assistants.<sup>21</sup> Among those responding only one institution could be found which had a degree-holding assistant in addition to the head librarian.

The surveys and other writings examined agree that junior college librarians need a broad general academic background as well as thorough professional training. Two studies, both published in 1952, deal with certain aspects of this problem.

Punke, whose goal was to discover the actual background of professional junior college staff members, based his analysis on information derived from catalogs of 125 junior colleges which were chosen to include at least eight institutions from each of the nine major geographical divisions of the U.S.<sup>22</sup> The author gives returns for public, private, and church related institutions as well as combined figures. As a group, he feels, the junior college librarians have not yet reached a sufficiently high level of training. He admonishes his colleagues to strive toward being on par educationally with those engaged in formal teaching.

The second article, by Mary Clay, concentrated on the particular needs of the administrative librarian.<sup>23</sup> She spoke as a member of the Committee on Preparation and Qualifications of College Librarians of the Association of College and Reference Librarians, a Division of



the American Library Association. Her recommendations, based on a poll conducted among only sixteen junior college librarians attending the Junior College Section meeting of the American Library Association Regional Conference in Fort Worth, Texas, in 1951, are concerned with pre-professional, professional, and continuing education. It is not surprising that in the area of pre-professional training a broad general background was stressed and that in the professional program a course in junior college education was deemed a most important elective. While the sample of those polled is not large enough to present these findings as the views of the profession, they are worth noting as the composite opinion of a number of well-informed junior college librarians.

In a recent investigation, the present writer showed that the profession is coming closer to the goals it has sought for years.<sup>24</sup> The findings of this study reveal that practically all professional librarians have usually—although not in all instances—faculty status. The faculty salary scale, perhaps the most important indicator of faculty status, in most cases applies to the junior college librarians. As a rule, the librarians are drawn into the educational process and share in the shaping of educational policies by serving on pertinent faculty committees. Usually, the librarians are high on the hierarchical ladder, reporting—although again not in all instances—to the highest officer of the college. Since all head librarians perform some administrative functions the question arises whether these are so numerous that the librarian should be classed as an administrator and be included in the special, usually higher, administrative pay schedule. This question has not been uniformly answered even within individual states.<sup>25</sup>

Library salary trends can be traced with the aid of *Library Statistics*, a publication issued by the U.S. Office of Education.<sup>26</sup> While this is probably the most detailed source, other compilations prepared by the U.S. Office of Education should also prove helpful. The reports entitled *Higher Education Salaries*,<sup>27</sup> for instance, might be consulted to advantage if librarians' salaries are to be compared with those received by other college instructors and administrators. Similarly useful are the biennially published salary studies of the National Education Association.<sup>28</sup>

As may be expected, the *Junior College Journal* carries important editorial comment as well as detailed articles on salaries, sometimes with particular reference to the junior college librarians' position within the administrative salary structure.<sup>29</sup>

### *Personnel for Junior College Libraries*

From an examination of these and other salary studies, it is evident that the financial situation of junior college library staffs has improved over the years just as the financial position of faculties in general has improved; that, as a group, librarians employed by institutions under public control have been receiving higher pay than those in institutions under private control; and that usually the pay differential between the junior college head librarian's salary and that of subordinate professional staff members is small.

From the limited experience so far gained it may be expected that the professional librarians will be assigned ranks in the same way as their colleagues engaged in class room teaching. Faculty rank, characterized by the titles of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor and professor, is still the exception rather than the rule in junior colleges. But the number of institutions which rank their faculty is increasing steadily.<sup>30</sup>

As a corollary to the demand that the junior college librarian be given faculty status and rank, it has been urged with equal force that he be given the opportunity to devote himself mainly to professional tasks. Walter C. Eells, for instance, writing in 1940, urged that junior college librarians be free to serve in professional capacities, for instance as counselors and educational consultants. The librarians' energies, Eells stressed, should not be absorbed by custodial and clerical tasks.<sup>31</sup>

Considerable progress has been made in terms of employment of full-time clerical assistants. Yet many institutions, especially in the enrollment categories of "under 500" and "500-999," are still lacking full-time library clerks.<sup>32</sup>

Once the principle has been established that clerks are necessary components of junior college library staffs, questions such as the following will arise: What should be the ratio of the non-professional to the professional staff, and what should be the clerks' compensation, their hours of work, and their preparation?<sup>33</sup>

A growing number of librarians feel that staffs would be enriched by an "in-between" category. Non-professional personnel can be more effective in performing library operations if they are systematically trained before hiring. For this reason the library technician or library aide category has been recommended. Since the graduate library schools do not provide instruction for the training of this category, this responsibility has been largely assumed by junior colleges. The aides who undergo library technician's training at junior colleges do

not necessarily intend to work in junior college libraries. They may seek a position in any type of a library. Even though the library technician category has not gained a firm foothold yet, the library technician programs deserve special attention, for it will be the junior college librarians with particular teaching skill who will act as the instructors of the library technician courses. The reactions to the library aide or technician programs have been generally favorable.<sup>34</sup> To assure a steady flow of non-professional persons who will undergo this training, it will be necessary to reward library technicians by assigning a proper position title, by added authority and, in particular, by financial increments.

Student assistants have always formed an integral part of the junior college library's staff. In 1940, when Harlen M. Adams published his survey, 97 per cent of the junior colleges responding to his inquiry utilized students.<sup>35</sup> Returns of a recent inquiry present a similar picture.<sup>36</sup> As in the past there is great variety in employment and service patterns. It is obvious that student aides are indispensable in institutions which have only one full-time staff member. As was mentioned previously, many of the smaller junior colleges have only one-man libraries. Here the student must be especially versatile since he is likely to be entrusted with jobs which in other libraries would be assigned to a clerk or even a professional assistant.

The Adams study shows that compensation received by students differed as between institutions, but money paid directly to the student ranked first. Non-financial forms of recognition such as academic credits, service points and merits were also found in a considerable number of cases. Today financial compensation has become practically the rule with other forms of recognition occurring rarely.

Students will become more valuable assistants if they are well-acquainted with the essentials of their job. To attain this objective, training—ranging from the rudimentary to the elaborate—is offered in nearly all libraries. A systematic, comprehensive approach will usually be reflected in the attainment of a higher level of performance on the part of the students.<sup>37</sup>

In hiring and in training students, the librarian must always keep in mind the help he can obtain from the student aides in the operation of the library. However, as an educator and as a member of the faculty, he may never neglect the opportunity to enrich the student's general background and to reinforce a student's sometimes latent desire to choose librarianship as a career.

## Personnel for Junior College Libraries

### References

1. Wilson, Louis R., and Tauber, Maurice F. *The University Library*. 2d ed. New York, Columbia University Press, 1956, p. 19.
2. Koos, Leonard V. *The Junior College*. (Research Publications of the University of Minnesota. Education Series, No. 5). Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1924.
3. Eells, Walter C. *The Junior College*. Boston, Houghton-Mifflin, 1931.
4. *Ibid.*, pp. 447-448.
5. "Minutes and Committee Reports: Committee on Standards: Junior College Standards," *Junior College Journal*, 1:334, Feb. 1931 (These standards no longer in effect in 1940); and "Minutes [of the Twentieth Annual Meeting of the American Association of Junior Colleges held in Columbia, Mo., Feb. 29-March 2, 1940] and Committee Reports: Executive Committee," *Junior College Journal*, 10:648, May 1940.
6. Adams, Harlen M. *The Junior College Library Program*. Chicago, American Library Association, 1940, pp. 9-11.
7. Homer, Eleanor M. "A Junior College 'Measuring Stick,'" *ALA Bulletin*, 24:296-297, Aug. 1930; and "Reports and Discussions: Junior College Section of American Library Association," *Junior College Journal*, 1:48, Oct. 1930.
8. Brubeck, Katherine M. "Influence on the Standards for Junior College Libraries of the Junior College Libraries Section of the Association of College and Reference Libraries of the American Library Association." Unpublished M.A. thesis prepared for the Florida State University Library School, 1954.
9. Association of College and Research Libraries, Committee on Standards. "Standards for Junior College Libraries," *College and Research Libraries*, 21:200-206, May 1960, esp. pp. 201-202 (staff).
10. Stone, Ermine. *The Junior College Library*. Chicago, American Library Association, 1932, pp. 31-32.
11. Bishop, William W. "Library Service in the Junior College," *Junior College Journal*, 5:456-461, May 1935.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 460.
13. Woods, James M. "An Administrator Looks at the Library (abridged printing)," *ALA Bulletin*, 31:782-785, Oct. 15, 1937; Johnson, B. Lamar. "The Junior College Library—An Opportunity for the Administrator," *College and Research Libraries*, 13:126-130, April 1952; "The Stephens College Library Plan: A Staff and Faculty Symposium (abridged printing)" (Held at the Kansas City Conference), *ALA Bulletin*, 32:826-830, Oct. 15, 1938; and Johnson, B. Lamar. *Vitalizing a College Library*. Chicago, American Library Association, 1939, p. 117.
14. A Report of the California Study of General Education in the Junior College. *General Education in Action* (by B. Lamar Johnson). Washington, American Council on Education, 1952, pp. 323-330; and Johnson, B. Lamar. "Toward General Education in the Junior College," *Junior College Journal*, 30: 518, May 1960.
15. American Library Association, Junior College Libraries Round Table. [Report of a Survey], *ALA Bulletin*, 26:569-575, Aug. 1932.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 570.

17. *Ibid.*, p. 573.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 575.
19. Adams, *op. cit.*, pp. 48, 58, 59.
20. Neal, Elizabeth. "Junior College Libraries in California," *Junior College Journal*, 9:376-377, April 1939.
21. Clay, Mary. "Looking at Our Texas Junior College Libraries," *Texas Outlook*, 23:37-40, Oct. 1939.
22. Punke, Harold H. "Educational Background of Junior-College Librarians," *School Review*, 60:298-301, May 1952.
23. Clay, Mary H. "Education for Administrative Librarians in Junior Colleges," *Junior College Journal*, 23:145-146, Nov. 1952.
24. Veit, Fritz. "Personnel." In Charles L. Trinkner, ed. *Library Services for Junior Colleges*. Northport, Ala., American Southern Publishing Co., 1964, pp. 80-92.
25. Carty, J. C. "Survey of Administrative Standing of Head Librarians in Two-Year Colleges in California," *Junior College Journal*, 490-492, April 1959.
26. U.S. Office of Education. *Library Statistics of Colleges and Universities, 1959-60—Part 1: Institutional Data*. Washington, U.S. Office of Education, 1961; and U.S. Office of Education. *Library Statistics of Colleges and Universities, 1959-60—Part 2: Analytic Report*. Washington, U.S. Office of Education, 1962—. [For earlier years see statistics which were privately gathered and published in the periodical, *College and Research Libraries*.]
27. U.S. Office of Education. *Higher Education Planning and Management Data, Salaries . . . 1957/58—*. Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1958—; and beginning with the fifth compilation, salaries have been separately reported in: *Higher Education: Salaries, 1961-62—*. Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962—.
28. National Education Association, Research Division. *Salaries Paid and Salary Practices in Universities, Colleges and Junior Colleges, 1955-56—*. Washington, National Education Association, 1956—.
29. Maul, Ray C. "Are Junior College Salaries Competitive?" *Junior College Journal*, 34:20-23, March 1964; and D'Amico, Louis A., and Morrison, D. Grant. "Salaries: 1963-1964," *Junior College Journal*, 35:17-22, Nov. 1964.
30. Blocker, Clyde E., and Wolfe, Wendell. "Academic Rank in Two-Year Colleges," *Junior College Journal*, 35:21-25, Dec. 1964—Jan. 1965.
31. Eells, Walter C. "Needed Developments in Junior College Libraries," *College and Research Libraries*, 1:347-356, Sept. 1940, esp. p. 354.
32. U.S. Office of Education. *Library Statistics of Colleges and Universities, 1959-1960. Part 2: Analytic Report (OE-15031-60)*. Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962, Tables 70 and 71, p. 35.
33. Veit, *op. cit.*, pp. 93-102.
34. Kinzer, Rose W. "A Discussion of the Library Aide or Clerk: His Status and Training," *Junior College Journal*, 32:217-224, Dec. 1961; Dwyer, William G. "End of an Experiment?" *Library Journal*, 87:3619-3622, Oct. 15, 1962; Gebhard, Patricia. "School for Ninety-Day Wonders," *Library Journal*, 88:2198-2200, June 1, 1963; Headings, Bernice E. "Training Program for Library Technicians," *College and Research Libraries*, 24:481-482, Nov. 1963; and McClure, Lois Carter. Letter dated May 12, 1963.

*Personnel for Junior College Libraries*

35. Adams, *op. cit.*, pp. 60-62.
36. Veit, *op. cit.*, pp. 102-106.
37. Smith, L. Herman. "Organizing and Training Student Assistants in a Junior College Library," *Wilson Library Bulletin*, 27:163-165, Oct. 1952.



## Building the Book Collection

HUMPHREY A. OLSEN

FUNCTIONING AS PART of a comparatively new institution operating in many areas that have not yet been pinpointed, junior college libraries face many of the same problems confronting their senior counterparts plus distinctive problems of their own. Enrollments have mushroomed in this country from less than 500,000 after World War II<sup>1</sup> to 927,534 in 1963, with the increase over the previous year alone amounting to 13 per cent.<sup>2</sup> In 1963 one in every four persons starting college enrolled at a junior college, and it is predicted that by 1970, 75 per cent of those entering college will first attend a community college.<sup>3</sup> With the enrollment explosion, it now takes all the running junior college librarians can do just to hold their own, and they will have to run twice as fast to improve conditions.

Attention will be focused in this paper on the differences between junior and senior institutions which affect the book collection, the characteristics of students, the facets of the collection, book selection, the reference collection, public documents, paperbacks, periodicals, and microforms.

One main difference between junior and senior colleges is the lack of research and research collections in the former. This simplifies matters for junior colleges, whereas other differences add complications: junior colleges can only influence students for two years instead of four or more as senior institutions can, and the diversity of junior college offerings often exceeds that of four-year colleges of the same size. The vast majority do not even remain two years, earlier transferring to other colleges, going off to jobs, or just dropping out. Instead of bemoaning the fact that not all students who attend a junior college can profit from the experience, these institutions capitalize on the situation by trying to do everything they can to help any misfits dur-

---

*The author is Librarian and Assistant Professor of English, Vincennes (Ind.) University Junior College.*

### *Building the Book Collection*

ing their short stay, whether it be a few weeks, a few months, or a year. The library, naturally, must do all it can to influence these persons as well as those who stay two years.

Norman E. Tanis has pointed out the “. . . complex nature of the American junior college . . .” and the often “bewildering diversity” of these institutions whose “burgeoning enrollments” are usually not accompanied by adequate finances.<sup>4</sup> Besides general courses and the traditional liberal arts, junior colleges offer terminal programs, technical and apprenticeship training, preparation for business and management, and adult programs—to mention only a few. Besides lacking sufficient finances, their libraries are often handicapped by staff shortages, lack of space, and the constantly rising costs of books and supplies. For example, in public junior colleges the ratio of professional library staff to students in 1963/64 was 1:1,054 and in private colleges 1:325,<sup>3</sup> whereas the standards call for one professional staff member for each 500 students enrolled.

The junior college library, operating in a challenging and little-explored territory between high school, vocational and technical school, senior college, and the adult department of the public library, has inherited some of the characteristics of each of these institutions, but the characteristics have been put together in different proportions in a new setting. The majority of students, just emerging from adolescence, are from eighteen to twenty-one years old. But allowance must be made for make-up, noncredit courses for those who read at the eighth grade level (or lower) or have other deficiencies, and for an older group with no upper age limit taking night classes. Thus in many cases the junior college provides a final opportunity to stimulate young adults to develop into well-rounded citizens alert to national and world problems and at the same time capable of enjoying literature, music, art, and other cultural activities. The book collection must meet the needs of these diverse groups.

Besides taking into consideration the characteristics of the students and the curricular offerings of the school, junior college librarians in building their collections need to make extensive studies of the effects of reading on students, particularly on students who come from homes with little or no cultural background. For instance, a teacher or librarian may recommend a book which he has enjoyed and from which he has profited, but how much does he really know about its appeal to and its influence on a student who is not book-minded? In the past we have assumed that such a recommendation is an important influ-



ence; but libraries today can no longer afford to operate on hunches. Long-range effects also must be examined thoroughly; why do many students who appear to be adequately motivated while in college lose interest in serious reading after graduation?

Albert Lake, although a public librarian, has set down some goals that apply equally to junior college libraries. The central collection "... would consist of books which have one or more qualities by which they have achieved a kind of immortality or give promise of doing so."<sup>5</sup> He describes a peripheral sub-collection made up of the minor novel, superficial commentaries, and trivial philosophies (which ideally should have little or no place in the junior college), as well as reference and other such books which are more concerned with facts than literary value.<sup>6</sup> Such a book as Rachel Carson's *The Sea Around Us* falls in Lake's first category by reason of its superb imaginative approach, and serves as an admirable introduction to the subject.<sup>7</sup> Librarians should be on the lookout for similar books.

The writer is acquainted with senior college and university librarians who strive to acquire attractively illustrated editions whenever they are available, editions such as Heritage Press publications and the Dodd, Mead *Great Illustrated Classics*. Surely it is even more important to select such books for junior college students, many of whom have difficulty in interpreting print.

In addition to books supporting the curriculum and the philosophy of the school, the library should build a collection of professional books to meet the needs of the faculty, and should also offer recreational reading. The latter area may be less important where public library and paperback outlets are handy.

Today's standard of 20,000 volumes for a junior college is a far cry from that of 4,000 set by the American Association of Junior Colleges in 1930,<sup>8</sup> but in the next few years this number will doubtless go even higher as enrollments swell, course offerings multiply, honors courses spread, and more teachers forsake the concept of a single textbook. Nationally only 23.4 per cent of junior college libraries meet the present standard, and the average number of books per student in public junior colleges is only 7.7, and in private ones 35.8.<sup>9</sup> In fifty of the sixty-two libraries surveyed by the writer, for which statistics were available, the average holdings were 16,738 volumes, the range from 4,000 to 41,750. The average number of books added for this same group of libraries during 1963/64 was 1,759, from a low of 300 (in two libraries) to 4,702.<sup>9</sup> It is not surprising that the library with the largest

### *Building the Book Collection*

collection added the greatest number of books, nor that one of the libraries adding 300 had the smallest collection.

The collection should be well-balanced with the intention of covering all phases of human activity, not just those dictated by the course offerings. Some idea of suitable percentages for different fields can be obtained from studying standard lists, but each school has its peculiar characteristics, and percentages must be worked out with these in mind.

For the forty-eight libraries which reported the per cent of the educational and general budget of the school spent on the library, the average was 4.7, the lowest, 1.8, and the highest, 12.5. Fifteen libraries had 5 per cent or above, with thirty-three falling below that mark.<sup>9</sup> On a national basis 47.3 per cent spend 5 per cent or more.<sup>3</sup>

The average proportion of the book budget reserved to be spent at the discretion of the librarian for buying encyclopedias, general books, and others crossing departmental lines, etc. was 37 per cent in the 28 libraries reporting this item. The range was from a low of 11 per cent to a high of 95 per cent. Nine librarians reported that 100 per cent of the fund was spent at their discretion; four reported no formal allotment, two stated the percentage was unknown, and one each said the amount was variable or none was allotted to be spent at the discretion of the librarian.

Libraries usually allocate amounts annually to departments on the basis of need. Many librarians find it advantageous to earmark a certain portion of the budget each year to be used in strengthening a weak area. As mentioned earlier in discussion of how to achieve a balanced collection, some idea of the importance of each field can be obtained from studying standard lists, although this information must always be modified to meet local conditions.

No individual should control entirely or almost entirely the process of selection. This statement applies to the head librarian or to any other person, no matter how well-trained and qualified he may be. In no single case among the sixty-two libraries surveyed did only one person do all the choosing. In thirty-nine libraries, however, the head librarian had the chief responsibility for selection; in ten libraries the teaching faculty had this responsibility. In three libraries the head librarian shared the responsibility equally with the teaching faculty; in three other instances he shared equally with the other members of the library staff, and in two cases equally with library staff, teaching faculty, administration, and students. In five instances other library

staff members had the main responsibility, but of course this would be impossible in libraries with a single professionally trained librarian. Forty-three stated that students participated in selection, and in twenty-six cases a library committee participated. Since the head librarian in many libraries is the person chiefly responsible for selection, even though in reality his role is mainly that of coordinator, it is valuable if he has had intensive bibliographic training in at least one subject field.

Branscomb's observation about the advantage a small library holds over a large one reads easily but is difficult to carry out in practice: "The fact that a small library intelligently selected is a better library than a larger one chosen without much discrimination, makes it easily possible for a college to overcome a financial handicap by careful planning."<sup>10</sup> Many times the small library is located far from large libraries where the librarian would have a chance to examine books before buying. The small library is more likely to be understaffed, with fewer selection aids, and poorly financed. Often selection must be done after hours or in time snatched from other vital duties.

Fewer book selection aids are available which meet the specific needs of junior college libraries than is true of elementary, high school, and public libraries. The new entry in the field of book selection periodicals is *Choice*, which, although it is slanted toward the senior liberal arts college, was rated very useful by twenty-seven librarians, fairly useful by nine, and of limited value by six. One librarian ignored the three categories suggested by the writer and labeled it "useful" without any qualification. Nineteen either had not seen it, were not ready to assess its value, or chose to ignore that part of the questionnaire. The writer requested librarians to list the six most valuable aids in order of their value, and *Choice* garnered more first place votes—seventeen—than any other aid, and was mentioned twenty-nine times in all. *Library Journal*, although it received only ten first place votes (two of them for its book reviews on cards), was mentioned thirty-six times, or more than any other aid. *New York Times Book Review* was placed first by nobody, yet was listed by thirty. *The Booklist and Subscription Books Bulletin: A Guide to Current Books* was the first choice of five librarians and was mentioned twenty-seven times in all. *Saturday Review*, with no first or second places, totaled nineteen mentions; *Publishers' Weekly* was rated first by four and was mentioned a total of seventeen times. Publishers' catalogs and advertisements also were first choice of four, with a total of seventeen men-

### *Building the Book Collection*

tions. *Book Review Digest* received eleven votes; *Book Week*, ten. The *London Times Literary Supplement* was mentioned by only three librarians, but two of them rated it first—which may suggest that many junior colleges are insufficiently acquainted with this aid. *New York Review of Books* was cited three times, and *Wilson Library Bulletin* six times for its reviews of reference books.

Of the selection aids in book form, Charles Trinkner's *Basic Books for Junior College Libraries* was first choice of all the aids in five cases, and was mentioned a total of nine times.<sup>11</sup> Hester Hoffman's *Reader's Adviser*, which received no first place votes, was mentioned by eleven.<sup>12</sup> Frank Bertalan's *Books for Junior Colleges*, probably because it is outdated (1954) and only a supplemental list, was mentioned only three times; a new basic edition, however, is being prepared and will include out-of-print as well as in-print titles.<sup>13</sup> *Subject Guide to Books in Print* and *Books in Print*, publications of R. R. Bowker Co., were mentioned six times and five times, respectively. Interestingly, the Florida State Department of Education *Basic Materials* series was cited by two librarians, neither of them in Florida.<sup>14</sup>

Of the sixty-two libraries surveyed, five reported a continuing program of checking against standard lists, while twenty-five others had checked against such lists since 1959. Other librarians were right in pointing out the scarcity of good recent junior college booklists; others stated that no library should depend too much on lists.

Thirty-five of the sixty-two libraries reported weeding constantly to eliminate out-of-date materials. In many cases, however, the wish is doubtless stronger than reality; of forty librarians reporting number of books withdrawn, the average was 205 volumes excluding two libraries which must have been undergoing a major overhaul in withdrawing 4,830 and 3,511 volumes, respectively.<sup>9</sup>

Most persons agree that the library should provide material on all sides of controversial questions, but the application of this principle to specific cases is often difficult. How many and what books should the library have in favor of Communism? If a local Birch Society presents the library with twenty-five books on the far right, should the library accept them and then proceed to balance them with an equal number on the far left?

Junior college librarians can often save money by cooperating with other libraries in their neighborhood, particularly by cutting down on duplicate buying of expensive sets which will receive comparatively little use. They can also make use of interlibrary loans to supplement

their collections. Of the thirty-nine libraries reporting interlibrary loans, the average for 1963/64 was forty-six. Although all interlibrary loans were lumped together under "interlibrary loan transactions," presumably most were loans from other libraries. The largest number of such loans reported was 305 and the smallest was 13. Of the eleven libraries not reporting interlibrary loans, five had less than 10,000 books each, two less than 12,000, two were near the 20,000 mark, and one had 29,000 volumes.<sup>9</sup> Surely libraries with under 20,000 books could profitably use interlibrary loan.

Textbooks should be purchased sparingly and only when no other more satisfactory material is available. Multiple copies should only be added when their purchase is clearly justified; this is particularly true in a small library, which already is likely to suffer from a shortage of suitable titles.

The reference collection will never include all the books which might be referred to for information but does include the books most likely to be consulted for specific information. The number will vary from library to library, but twenty-six libraries which reported this item to the writer in 1963 had an average of 1,390 reference volumes (excluding bound periodicals). The average ratio of their reference collections to total bookstock was 8.4 per cent. Since even college and university libraries feel the need for at least one set of encyclopedias at the high school level, such as *World Book Encyclopedia*, junior colleges will feel a similar need. Constance Winchell's *Guide to Reference Books* was mentioned by eight librarians as an essential selection aid, and others mentioned *The Booklist and Subscription Books Bulletin* and *Wilson Library Bulletin*. Because of the high cost, reference sets should be purchased only after careful consideration.

Documents—United Nations, national, and state—should be acquired as needed from catalogs issued by various agencies. But if there is a government depository nearby, the junior college library may not need to duplicate documents available there. Small libraries, in particular, should supplement their limited holdings with pamphlets obtained free or at a reasonable price through information furnished in the *Vertical File Index*.

In the sixty-two libraries surveyed by the writer, paperbacks are purchased by forty-eight when hard-bound editions are not available and by twenty-four libraries for additional copies of hard-bound editions. Thirty-eight libraries purchase paperbacks and have them bound, while four others sometimes do this. Four libraries mentioned

### *Building the Book Collection*

reinforcing paperbacks instead of binding them, even though hard-bounds are available, in order to save money, particularly in cases where the paperbacks would receive relatively little use. Three purchase prebound paperbacks, and two libraries have uncataloged collections of popular paperbacks, such as mysteries and westerns. No library reported that it was currently selling paperbacks, although one had done so in the past but had given up the practice because of a limited staff. As vending machines become available which will make it possible for libraries to sell selected paperbacks, libraries may enter this business and become a powerful force in stimulating students to build up libraries of their own.

Dorothy Mae Poteat has suggested 122 as the minimum number of magazines for the junior college.<sup>15</sup> The fifty libraries answering this question reported an average of 167 periodicals, ranging from 73 to 518; thirteen had fewer than 122 and eight under 100.<sup>9</sup> A survey of thirty-two junior college libraries by the writer in 1963 disclosed an average of seven newspapers received. Besides local, state, and national newspapers, every library should have at least one foreign newspaper of the caliber of *The Manchester Guardian*. Periodicals should be selected not only with their relation to curricular offerings in mind but also to their reference value through use of back copies by way of periodical indexes.

Charles Joseph Benson concluded, from a study of the use of periodicals in a junior college library, that "More than half of the use of periodicals seems to have been more or less unrelated to course work."<sup>16</sup> He felt that in many cases "the junior college librarian might well decide that acquisition of materials for recreational purposes unrelated to courses of instruction should be made only after full support has been given to the instructional program."<sup>16</sup>

Of the sixty-two librarians queried by this writer, fifty-nine took *Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature*, two the *Abridged Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature* and one received no periodical index at all. The number of subscriptions to other indexes were: *Education Index*, 27; *International Index to Periodicals*, 26; *Applied Science and Technology Index*, 15; *Business Periodicals Index*, 11; *New York Times Index*, 10; *Biography Index*, 8; *Art Index*, 6; *Public Affairs Information Service*, 5; *Cumulative Index to Nursing Literature*, 5; *Book Review Digest*, 4 (doubtless taken by many more libraries which consider it primarily a book selection aid); *Library Literature* and *Biological and Agricultural Index*, 3; *Catholic Periodical Index*, *Index to Dental*

*Literature in the English Language, Historical Abstracts 1775-1945 and Biological Abstracts, 2; Engineering Index, Architectural Index, Accountants' Index, Christian Science Monitor Index, Chemical Abstracts, Psychological Abstracts, and Abstracts of English Studies*, one each.

Of sixty-two libraries surveyed, five mentioned having some Xerox or other photocopies of books but did not specify the number. Twelve libraries had microfilm copies, ranging from 2 to 2,000 with an average of 419. Four libraries have the *New York Times* on microfilm; two libraries each reported having eighty-six periodicals on microfilm. The only library which reported having Microcards had two books in this form. The argument on bound magazines versus magazines on microfilm continues; but if the library has sufficient space, bound periodicals have several advantages. Microfilm for newspapers, on the other hand, means added permanence, a great saving in space, and greater convenience in use.

Junior college librarians, along with others, will watch with interest the revolutionary library on microfiche (3" by 5" transparent sheets) envisioned by Park Forest (Ill.) College. Each student will be provided with an individual projector the size of a lunch box. By this means the college hopes to cut the cost of a million volumes from 25 million dollars to two million.<sup>17</sup> However this experiment turns out, books in something like their present form are likely to play an important role in the junior college library's future, if the library can survive the severe growing pains and the lack of focus from which it now suffers.

### References

1. Brick, Michael. *Forum and Focus for the Junior College Movement: The American Association of Junior Colleges*. New York, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963, p. 24.
2. *1964 Junior College Directory of the American Association of Junior Colleges*. Washington, D.C., American Association of Junior Colleges, 1964, p. 5.
3. Gould, Samuel B. Letter dated April 12, 1965, including *Summary of National Junior College Library Statistics, 1963-64*, distributed with covering letter from the Association of College and Research Libraries. (Multilithed; unpagd.)
4. Tanis, Norman E. "Implementing the Junior College Standards," *College and Research Libraries*, 22:130, March 1961.
5. Lake, Albert. "Book Selection Standards: Education or Communication?" *Wilson Library Bulletin*, 37:674, April 1963.
6. *Ibid.*, pp. 672-675.

### *Building the Book Collection*

7. Carson, Rachel. *The Sea Around Us*. New York, Oxford University Press, 1951.
8. Stone, Ermine. *The Junior College Library*. Chicago, American Library Association, 1932, p. 53.
9. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. *Library Statistics of Colleges and Universities, 1963-64: Institutional Data* (by Theodore Samore). Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1965, pp. 8-59.
10. Branscomb, B. Harvie. *Teaching with Books: A Study of College Libraries*. Chicago, American Library Association, Association of American Colleges, 1940, p. 176.
11. Trinkner, Charles. *Basic Books for Junior College Libraries: 20,000 Vital Titles*. Northport, Ala., Colonial Press, 1963.
12. Hoffman, Hester. *The Reader's Adviser; An Annotated Guide to the Best in Print in Literature*. 10th ed., rev. and enl. New York, R. R. Bowker Co., 1964.
13. Bertalan, Frank Joseph, comp. *Books for Junior Colleges; A List of 4,000 Books, Periodicals, Films, and Filmstrips*. Chicago, American Library Association, 1954.
14. Florida, State Department of Education. *Basic Materials Series*. 1960-.
15. Poteat, Dorothy Mae, comp. *Basic Materials for Florida Junior College Libraries: Magazines*. (Florida State Education Department, Division of Community Junior Colleges. Materials Bulletin No. 22 CJC-2). Tallahassee, Fla., Florida State Department of Education, 1960, p. 2.
16. Benson, Charles Joseph. *Study of the Student Use of Periodicals in a Junior College Library*. Unpublished M.A. thesis prepared for the Graduate School of Library Science, University of Chicago, 1955, pp. 67, 70. (Microfilm.)
17. Gorlick, Arthur. "View Dynamic New College," *Chicago Daily News* (Red Arrow Weekend Edition), Nov. 9, 1963, p. 3.





## Junior College Library Processing

JAMES W. PIRIE

A SURVEY of the processing activities of junior college libraries is reminiscent of the labors of Sisyphus. No matter where or however intensively one's efforts have been directed at recording the myriad practices and procedures of scores of libraries, the investigator sees questions imperfectly phrased, understood, and answered. The simple truth is that methods of processing in a more or less homogeneous group of libraries are so bewildering in their variety and ingenious in their meeting of problems in different ways that any attempt to capture a true picture of them on paper produces results that must be approached cautiously.

The libraries of junior colleges vary enormously in size and in scope. As service agencies of their colleges, they reflect to a substantial degree the philosophy and conditions of the institutions they serve. As the junior colleges themselves differ in great degree, and in these turbulent years are constantly changing in objectives and organization, so their libraries are also changing. Junior college libraries are different now from what they were ten years ago: larger, more completely oriented to the college field, and more in tune with current professional thought. The next ten years will without doubt see similar changes.

This review of the technical service activities characteristic of junior college libraries is based principally on a survey conducted in the winter of 1962-63, although a substantial use is made of results shown by Arthur Ray Rowland in his article on "Cataloging and Classification in Junior College Libraries."<sup>1</sup>

Any survey is suspect, and that generalization is no less true for this one. The response, even should it go as high as 50 to 60 per cent, is no guarantee that a representative quality has been achieved. There is a strong suspicion that this one has been skewed or distorted by the

James W. Pirie is Librarian of the Charles Stewart Mott Library, which serves the Flint Community Junior College and Flint College of the University of Michigan.

### *Junior College Library Processing*

fact that relatively more medium-sized and large libraries answered the questionnaire than did small ones. We can only speculate as to the reasons for this.

Possibly one reason is that the smaller libraries do not as often have the sophistication of adequate records. In certain cases it was apparent from a few responses that some of those in charge of junior college libraries did not recognize terms of common parlance among librarians. It is perfectly easy to visualize some consigning a questionnaire to the wastepaper basket rather than struggling over four pages of technical queries. Finally—and this is offered in all humility—it may be that in a time such as ours, which equates size with virtue, the keeper of a small library may simply not want to record the sad details, even though he is doing a fine job with few resources.

However untrustworthy the method, the questionnaire was sent to 216 junior college libraries drawn from the *Educational Directory, 1961-1962*.<sup>2</sup> Replies were received from 145, or 67 per cent, of which ten were unusable. Tabulations were then based upon 135 replies, constituting 62.4 per cent of the total, representing thirty-five states in the continental United States.

The size of their book collections is shown in Table 1, and varied from a low of 1,250 to a giant of 98,500 items. The mean of this group is 21,700 volumes, with a median of 18,000; over 59 per cent of the libraries have resources under 20,000 items—including books, bound

TABLE 1  
*Size of Book Collection of 135 Junior College Libraries*

<i>Number of Books</i>	<i>Number of Libraries</i>	<i>Per Cent</i>
0 - 4,999	6	04.5
5,000 - 9,999	19	14.1
10,000 - 14,999	25	18.5
15,000 - 19,999	30	22.2
20,000 - 24,999	19	14.1
25,000 - 29,999	11	08.2
30,000 - 34,999	9	06.7
35,000 - 39,999	6	04.5
40,000 - 44,999	3	02.2
45,000 - 49,999	2	01.3
50,000 - 84,999	0	00.0
85,000 - 89,999	4	03.0
90,000 - 94,999	0	00.0
95,000 - 100,000	1	00.7
Total	135	100%

JAMES W. PIRIE

periodicals, microforms, pamphlets, and recordings, but not counting audio-visual material such as films and filmstrips.

Annual expenditures for library resources ran the gamut from \$200 to \$58,472 (see Table 2). The mean for expenditures is \$11,200, with a median of \$9,650. Since well over 50 per cent spent less than \$10,000, this group is shown in greater detail, in Table 3.

TABLE 2  
*Annual Expenditures of 135 Junior College Libraries*

<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>Number of Libraries</i>	<i>Per Cent</i>
\$ 0 - 4,999	39	28.9
5,000 - 9,999	31	23.0
10,000 - 14,999	30	22.2
15,000 - 19,999	20	14.9
20,000 - 24,999	6	04.5
25,000 - 29,999	5	03.7
30,000 - 34,999	0	00.0
35,000 - 39,999	1	00.7
40,000 - 44,999	1	00.7
45,000 - 49,999	0	00.0
50,000 - 54,999	1	00.7
55,000 - 60,000	1	00.7
Total	135	100%

TABLE 3  
*Annual Expenditures of 70 Junior College Libraries with Less than  
\$10,000 Annual Expenditures Each*

<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>Number of Libraries</i>
\$ 0 - 999	2
1,000 - 1,999	4
2,000 - 2,999	7
3,000 - 3,999	15
4,000 - 4,999	11
5,000 - 5,999	6
6,000 - 6,999	6
7,000 - 7,999	9
8,000 - 8,999	6
9,000 - 9,999	4
Total	70

In resources added to the libraries' working collections, an average of just over 1,100 items was found (see Table 4). The mean figure is 1,120, and the median is 965.

*Junior College Library Processing*

TABLE 4

*Number of Books Added in 1962 by 135 Junior College Libraries*

<i>Number of Books Added</i>	<i>Number of Libraries</i>	<i>Per Cent</i>
0 - 999	37	27.4
1,000 - 1,999	36	26.7
2,000 - 2,999	29	21.6
3,000 - 3,999	16	11.9
4,000 - 4,999	9	06.7
5,000 - 5,999	2	01.3
6,000 - 6,999	4	03.0
7,000 - 7,999	1	00.7
8,000 - 16,999	0	00.0
17,000 - 18,000	1	00.7
Total	135	100%

Almost all libraries performed processing services, including ordering, cataloging, and bindery preparation. The extent varied with the service performed. The preparation of orders, which includes searching in the catalog and order files, and clarification of bibliographic details such as edition, publisher, and price, was performed by 129 of the libraries replying to this question. Four libraries did not do so. The dispatch of orders to suppliers, on the other hand, was left to other agencies to a large degree. Fifty-one libraries sent off their own orders, while eighty-two forwarded their book orders to other hands (48 or 59 per cent by the college business or purchasing office, 30 or 37 per cent by the board of education business or purchasing office, and 4 or 5 per cent by other libraries or other agencies). Even the college president had a hand in the dispatch of orders in one case. One would think that a president might occupy himself in a more fruitful fashion than acting as a way station for book orders.

The reason a large majority of the junior college libraries participating in the survey did not place their orders directly with the suppliers is probably because many junior colleges have their financial and administrative bases in boards of education. The boards, by legal interpretation of their responsibilities for public funds, or by inclination, are reluctant to allow the commitment of money by any except the duly authorized business office. Some libraries in similar situations have persuaded their boards that they may be designated as agencies of the business or purchasing office and may send out book orders directly to publishers, agents, and bookdealers.

Another factor that should be mentioned is that many libraries do

not have the staff to control adequately expenditures by accounting methods. Answers to the survey question relating to accounting of book funds showed that most libraries did not have the primary responsibility in accounting for book funds; 39 libraries (29 per cent) handled their own accounts, 60 (45 per cent) had their financial accounts handled by the college business office, 29 (21 per cent) by the board of education business office, and 7 (5 per cent) by other agencies, e.g., state auditors, county purchasing office, and district business office. There appeared to be a considerable overlap in accounting, in that the parent organization kept the official books while the library kept an informal tally of expenditures against the subject allocations of the book fund, where such allocations existed.

Nearly every one of the junior college libraries participated in the cataloging process to a greater or lesser degree. Most did all of their cataloging, while in other cases the larger part was performed by a commercial firm or by agencies such as a public, county, or a central district library. Only one library out of 132 responding to the question did not perform any cataloging work. Of the other 131 libraries, 121 did all cataloging themselves; of the ten that had outside help, seven used Alanar Book Service, and all ten did some cataloging, such as rush books or material that could not be supplied by Alanar.

Rowland found that in over 70 per cent of junior college libraries the head librarian does the cataloging in addition to his other duties, and that only 17.3 per cent enjoy the service of a full-time cataloger. Clerical assistance in cataloging is scarce; less than 20 per cent of the libraries have one or more full-time clerks assisting with the work, and more than 60 per cent have no clerks at all for cataloging work.<sup>3</sup>

It is apparent that for many libraries a clear-cut organization and assignment of responsibility for cataloging is not possible. The usual small staff size often requires that all available hands pitch in and participate in both cataloging and order preparation, so that there may be a situation in which two or more professional librarians will each be doing processing work on a part-time basis in addition to public service and other tasks. In such a milieu, any discussion of separate order and catalog departments or of a combined technical services department is almost meaningless.

Junior college libraries consistently use the Dewey decimal classification; only five libraries (4 per cent of the total) used Library of Congress classification. There is a sense of dissatisfaction with Dewey, although it is well below one-quarter of all responses, and in most

### *Junior College Library Processing*

cases the dissatisfaction is not strong enough to force a change to another system. Out of 135 libraries polled, 105 feel it is doing a good job for them while 25 noted faults that included difficulty in keeping up-to-date, and inconsistency in subject placement. One library complained that the sixteenth edition of Dewey segmented general subjects too much, while another deplored its lack of flexibility.

Only six libraries were considering a change in classification, in most cases to Library of Congress, but one library wished to consider a drastic modification of Dewey such as the Lamont Library system. A separate biography class is used by 75 per cent of the libraries, although two libraries departed from this procedure partially to place artists, musicians, and authors with the subject. Usually the letter B, or 92, or 921 is used for individual biography, and 920 for collected biography. It is somewhat surprising that 25 per cent of the responses indicated that biography was placed with the subject matter in Dewey.

Cutter numbers were used by nearly four out of five libraries employing Dewey; 79 per cent did so, and 21 per cent did not. There was some variation in the latter group, in that Cutter numbers were used by some libraries only in areas such as fiction and biography and not in the main classification. A separate fiction class was used by 83 per cent of the junior college libraries, usually designated by F or Fiction or Fic. and followed by the author's full name, the first letter of his name, or the appropriate Cutter number. Less than one fifth, or 17 per cent of the libraries, classified fiction in the 800's as literature.

A large number of respondents indicated use of Library of Congress subject headings; 67 (or 50 per cent) used the L.C. list, 43 (32 per cent) used Sears, 21 (15 per cent) used L.C. and Sears, and 4 (3 per cent) used other lists. These included Ball's *Subject Headings for the Information File*, *Readers' Guide*, Sears and *Subject Headings for Catholic Libraries*, and a three-decker combination of Sears, L.C., and the old American Library Association list.

Rowland's survey indicated that where L.C. and Sears were both used, all libraries used L.C. headings on L.C. cards and Sears' headings on Wilson cards or where original cataloging was done. A serious question of conflict of headings could occur in such a situation where L.C. and Sears' headings on comparable subjects vary.

Subject authority files were maintained by eighty-one libraries (or 60 per cent) while fifty-four (40 per cent) did not do so. The preferred form of the authority file was a checked copy of a standard list in fifty-four libraries (67 per cent), a card file in nineteen libraries (23

per cent) and entries in the card catalog in eight libraries (10 per cent). The use of the card catalog as a subject authority file was surprising, at least to the author, and it may be of some interest to describe its operation. Subject headings are drawn from whatever list is being used, are typed on the cards, and the cards filed unless there is an apparent conflict with headings already used or if the heading has not been used. In the former case, the conflict must be resolved with a decision, and in the latter case the heading is considered and adopted or changed and the appropriate references made. The system seems more applicable to larger libraries where the subject headings in use will be more numerous.

A good proportion of these libraries felt that the subject heading lists in use were inadequate; 26 per cent were not satisfied, with the most common complaints being not comprehensive enough, not enough "see" and "see also" references, and too general in terms used. Other faults mentioned were too detailed, too many references, too specific in its terms, out-of-date terminology, confusing terminology, and too frequent changes. Few libraries—10 per cent—were considering a change in their list, and half of these wanted only a modification of their present list. Six libraries were interested in adopting the L.C. list; only one inclined to Sears.

A very large majority of libraries used the A.L.A. filing rules, 105 (84 per cent); 19 (14 per cent) used L.C. rules, and 11 (8 per cent) others, e.g., Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh, Cleveland Public Library, Los Angeles Public School System, University of Washington, Streamline Filing, and locally developed rules.

There was evidenced a decided preference for the dictionary form of card catalog (113 libraries or 84 per cent), although a somewhat surprising number are using a divided catalog (22 libraries or 16 per cent), and it was evident from comments that a considerable number of libraries felt an interest in it. In eighteen libraries, the divided catalog consisted of author-title, and subject files; in four libraries, there were author, title, and subject files. Two libraries used a variation of the author-title, and subject division of the catalog, in which personal names as subjects are included in the author-title file, to assure that books by and about an author are brought together. This is desirable from the viewpoint of the catalog user, even though it introduces a complexity, and it is possible for a name to appear as subject although there may be no works by him in the library.

The major determinant of junior college library processing is the

### *Junior College Library Processing*


size of the staff. It is small—sometimes excruciatingly so—and a constant cry in the survey answers was: "I am the only librarian," "I have to do everything," and "There is no help!" As Rowland has said, a major problem is the lack of help that forces a librarian to devote time to clerical tasks instead of to professional work.<sup>4</sup> One cannot but be moved by the idealism and devotion shown in the many pencilled comments of hope and anticipation of better things to come—not for comfort or aggrandizement—but for the opportunity to give better service.

Junior college libraries themselves are on the small side, with over 59 per cent of them with collections below 20,000 items. This factor imposes or encourages certain processing characteristics that are usually connected with smaller institutions—although it is true that some larger libraries share in them too. Dewey is overwhelmingly preferred in classification; A.L.A. filing rules and separate biography and fiction classes are favored. It seems clear that a major need in the area under discussion is for more intensive study of each of the several subjects treated.

### *References*

1. Rowland, Arthur Ray. "Cataloging and Classification in Junior College Libraries," *Library Resources and Technical Services*, 7:254-258, Summer, 1963.
2. U.S. Office of Education. *Education Directory 1961-1962, Part 3: Higher Education*. Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962.
3. Rowland, *op. cit.*, p. 256.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 258.





## Readers' Services

J. P. VAGT

MOST PRESENT-DAY librarians have an innate desire to be all things to all people when called upon to render services relating to books and reading. One of them recently described this tendency thus: "We hold in common with all other librarians a built-in compulsion to render service when requested."<sup>1</sup> Although this "compulsion" is beginning to cause trouble as resources are stretched to the breaking point by ever-increasing demands, the search continues for new services to offer, and for ways to make old ones seem new.

This is an especially commendable trait on the part of librarians who serve junior colleges, because it blends perfectly with the over-all philosophy which governs this segment of the educational field. The junior college movement has been a service movement from its beginning, designed to meet a wide-range of educational needs. Its purposes have been summarized as including preparation for advanced study, provision of vocational education and general education, plus community service.<sup>2</sup> In addition to this, one writer insists that junior college libraries themselves must be "service oriented" if they are to fulfill their responsibilities to their communities.<sup>3</sup> An institution with objectives such as these and a profession with a "compulsion to render service" should certainly find themselves ideally mated! It follows, therefore, that readers' services are probably of greater importance in the junior college library than in any other type of academic library.

These services may be divided, for convenience, into two groups: those of an educational nature, and those of a utilitarian nature. The first group includes all readers' advisory service, reference work, and all instruction in the use of libraries. The second group includes circulation work, reserve book services, interlibrary loans, and service in-

---

The author was formerly Librarian of Odessa College, Odessa, Texas; at present he is Director of Libraries, Midwestern University, Wichita Falls, Texas.

### *Readers' Services*

volving the use of machinery, such as duplication services, or provision of equipment for listening to tapes and records.

The importance of both groups can hardly be over-emphasized, and both must be highly developed in a library that claims to provide a balanced program. Traditionally, the second group of services has probably received greater emphasis. To function at all, a library must have some sort of circulation system. It must make arrangements for reserve books, and the availability of the equipment necessary for the other services mentioned depends mainly upon the affluence of the parent institution. Little imagination is required for basic provision of these services, although they can surely be refined and made more efficient through thoughtful planning and operation.

The educational group of services is receiving increasing attention from concerned librarians in recent years. This is a natural result of the present-day concept of the library as an educational force, which is rapidly replacing the storage and preservation function assigned to libraries of past generations. The teaching function of modern libraries is clearly stated by Felix Hirsch as follows: "What is the essence of the new standards? It is the concept of the library as the intellectual powerhouse of the junior college, and, as a corollary, the concept of the junior college librarian as an educator."<sup>4</sup> Hirsch refers here to the standards for junior college libraries which were adopted by the Association of College and Research Libraries in 1960.<sup>5</sup>

The world of junior college libraries offers many outstanding examples of effective readers' service programs which are being used to enhance the educational functions of the libraries involved. Marion Harris described the philosophy behind the organization for reference service at Los Angeles City College some years ago. She wrote of the "... importance placed on the teaching function in the library. This is the primary motive that is always in the background of service to the student public."<sup>6</sup>

Norman Tanis recently described a successful program of taking readers' services to the students and faculty in the technical curriculum at Henry Ford Community College.<sup>7</sup> He pointed out that instructors in these courses are usually men outside the academic community and with little knowledge of library resources. Students often have little contact with academic courses which require library use. Reaching these individuals with an effective readers' service program enriches the courses involved. But Tanis speculates on an even greater possible benefit: "If we are successful, we will have produced a

library-minded student who can effectively use any library, public or private, for the rest of his life.”<sup>8</sup>

Some extra indexing is done at San Antonio College, Texas, to facilitate the readers’ service program. J. O. Wallace, Librarian, describes the work done and the atmosphere his staff attempts to create, as follows:

We have several practices which aid students. We have indexed a number of periodicals ourselves which are not in the usual periodical indexes. We have another index of plays in collections not in Ottemiller. Our pamphlet file subjects are all represented in the card catalog by a subject card directing the students to the subject. We attempt to compile bibliographies and discographies related to the curriculum whenever warranted. We do index our record collection so that there are analytics for every selection. Especially do we attempt to make the students in the library feel that they can turn to any librarian at any time.<sup>9</sup>

Compiled with a specific strata of users in mind, indexes such as these will greatly increase the efficiency of the staff member on duty, as well as reduce his time-cost in providing answers.

Probably the best-known program of readers’ services in junior college circles is the almost total fusion of such services with the instructional program achieved by B. Lamar Johnson at Stephens College while he was both Librarian and Dean of Instruction at that institution. His spectacular accomplishments are summarized in his book, *The Librarian and the Teacher in General Education*.<sup>10</sup> Although Stephens College’s student body is not typical of the average public junior college in America, still much of Johnson’s work must be considered carefully for possible general application to junior college library practice.

Interest in experimentation continues to the present time at Stephens College, Columbia, Mo., with concrete results showing in the college’s new “learning center” described by Neal Balanoff.<sup>11</sup> This remarkable cluster of buildings combines library, classrooms, electronics communications center, and fine arts center into one unit which “. . . is designed to encourage inter-related use of electronic and mechanical aids to education in an environment conducive to learning.”<sup>12</sup> The years of planning for the Center are recounted in an article by the Chairman of the Humanities Division at Stephens. She voices anew Johnson’s philosophy of the library’s place in the instructional process when she says: “There is no line of demarcation between the librarian

### *Readers' Services*

as an instructor and the classroom teacher as an instructor.”<sup>13</sup> Indeed, Stephens College may be approaching the ultimate in molding the library to the educational process.

One interesting facet of readers' services in junior college libraries is that in most cases all the professionally trained members of the staff serve patrons. There seems to be no sharp division of staff members' duties between technical processing and public service, as in most other types of libraries. Marion Harris has stated that all staff members at Los Angeles City College (eight in number) participate in readers' services.<sup>14</sup> An examination of the *Procedures Manual* from San Antonio College reveals the same situation there. In fact, J. O. Wallace underscored this point when he wrote: “A brief examination of the duty assignments of the staff will show you that by no means do we have a traditional reference-circulation-technical services differentiation. Every member of my staff does something in each of these areas.”<sup>9</sup>

Ruth Scarborough, Librarian at Centenary College for Women, echoes this practice in her library. She wrote: “Readers services are not handled by one person, but by all the library staff, five in number.”<sup>15</sup> Charles Trinkner, Librarian at Pensacola Junior College, in discussing the organization for readers' services in his library wrote: “The key to our situation is that all but the technical processing person can work in the immediate vicinity of the control point (circulation desk). Ready reference, vocational guidance, academic guidance, library instruction are always available to the students.”<sup>16</sup> Trinkner's staff consists of three professional librarians; two of them work together in giving service to readers. Thus, as the junior college library grows beyond the province of a one-man operation, the staff members continue to enjoy the benefits of the contrasting challenges presented by both main aspects of librarianship. In this day of ever increasing specialization, and the inevitable narrowing of the human spirit which accompanies it, this aspect of junior college librarianship is noteworthy.

An essential prerequisite for a strong readers' services program in any library is an adequate number of staff members. It should be noted that the libraries already discussed have relatively large staffs for junior colleges. Los Angeles City College has eight trained librarians taking a turn at readers' services.<sup>14</sup> San Antonio College has five librarians and four clerks.<sup>17</sup> Stephens College has seven librarians and nine clerks.<sup>17</sup> What about the library with only one or two librarians,

and one or perhaps no clerks? It is evident from a brief perusal of the current *American Junior Colleges*<sup>18</sup> that libraries with staffs this size are in the majority in this country. Is it possible for them to offer a satisfactory program of readers' services to their users?

Many of them are not doing so, according to a recent strong indictment of junior college libraries on this very point.<sup>19</sup> John F. Harvey, who is Dean of the Graduate School of Library Science at Drexel Institute of Technology, has visited many junior colleges in recent years. He says that although some of them offer a high level program of services from their libraries, this is by no means true of all of them.

Most of the librarians were so busy with circulation and cataloging that they had very little time to work with faculty members in developing the curriculum. . . . They were doing clerical work. . . . These librarians did not become strong educational forces on their campuses. . . . The library staff was usually poor. . . . With such staffs, these librarians could come nowhere near achieving the quality of service suggested in the standards. Very little time was available to give reading guidance to individual students and faculty members. . . .<sup>20</sup>

This is a serious charge and comes from an authoritative source. It deserves careful consideration.

The problem of "very little time" for readers' services is common to most small libraries and should be faced squarely because of its extreme importance. Two approaches to its solution exist. The first consists of careful planning of physical quarters for optimum efficiency in giving readers' services. The second is agitation for an increase in staff.

Careful planning of physical quarters is most fruitful before a new building is erected, of course, but it also can often work wonders in a building already in existence. Robert Pierson discusses the problem of location of service areas and offers this cogent remark: "When I speak of accessibility I have in mind not how far the librarian must walk but rather how far and how fast he must run if he is to watch the door, stay near the phone, greet the public, help at the index table. . . ." <sup>21</sup> etc. Pierson's chief concern is with plans for a new building, but his suggestions can be adapted to the reorganization of many existing situations so that the distance a librarian must run to fulfill his varied obligations may at least be reduced, if not eliminated.

However, even a perfectly organized physical plant will not solve the problem of a true staff shortage. If it can be established that serv-

### *Readers' Services*

ice is being curtailed for lack of personnel, then the librarian's chief responsibility automatically becomes the procurement of additional staff members. This usually requires a series of persuasive sessions with the institution's chief administrator. Before these sessions begin, the librarian must arm himself with exact and detailed information relating to his needs. He must know if his needs require additional professional personnel, or if added clerical help will release present professional librarians from routine duties, enabling them to concentrate on services to students which their training has prepared them to give.

Armed with a knowledge of his needs and a willingness to expend some time and effort in attaining them, the librarian is ready to approach his chief administrator. The recommendations concerning staff size given in the "Standards for Junior College Libraries"<sup>22</sup> furnish excellent backing for the librarian who is seeking additional positions. It cannot be over-emphasized to junior college administrators that an adequate staff is co-equal in importance with a strong materials collection as essential steps in making the library an educational factor on the college campus.

Instruction in the use of libraries is another readers' service of great importance to beginning college students. It is probably one of the most generally necessary areas in the entire college curriculum. Stanley Gwynn contends that it is actually one of the liberal arts.<sup>23</sup> All of this places heavy responsibility on junior college librarians for a program of instruction in the use of libraries. This program must consist of much more than a guided tour of the library if it is to be effective. It must be a carefully planned course that has been worked out in cooperation with interested faculty members and designed for the specific needs of each situation. One writer underlined the needs for such a course in this manner:

"Freshman orientation programs, conducted tours through our libraries, handbooks or guides—regardless of their value to the individual student—these do not take the place of a thorough and detailed consideration of the modern tools of research and the techniques of tackling an unknown subject."<sup>24</sup>

The same writer continues with an outline of what such a program should include. Patricia Knapp also gives an excellent guide to the preparation of an introductory course in library use.<sup>25</sup> While junior college students are not concerned with the problems of research found at upper division or graduate levels, they do need compre-

hensive guidance in making use of libraries. A program of instruction which is adapted to his needs should be one of the services available to every junior college student.

The second category of readers' services, designated as being chiefly of a utilitarian nature, also deserves consideration by junior college librarians. A cumbersome or inadequate circulation system may be a serious hindrance to an otherwise satisfactory library program. According to one authority, a circulation system should provide the following information: (1) the location of any book at any given time, (2) the date the book is due, and (3) the record of books borrowed by each individual reader.<sup>26</sup> Small libraries can usually use systems which provide all three of these records, but as circulation increases it often becomes necessary to drop one or more of them. The record of books borrowed by individual borrowers is usually the first to go. The "best" circulation system for a specific library is probably an adaptation of several systems, fitted to provide the features needed in that specific case. A good summary of the systems now in general use is contained in the Library Technology Project's publication, *Study of Circulation Control Systems*.<sup>27</sup> Librarians who are planning to set up a new system, or who are seeking to improve an old one, should consult this study.

Reserve books are a problem every library must face. Until enough copies of all books for all students can be provided, some system of placing on reserve copies of books in heavy demand must be provided in all academic libraries, junior college libraries included. Probably the most widely used practice is to place the books on a shelf at the circulation desk and control their use from that point. Open-shelf reserves have been used with good results in some cases.

Interlibrary loan service, according to the Code adopted in 1952,<sup>28</sup> is designed for graduate students and faculty members engaged in serious research. These are reasonable limitations and should be observed by everyone. Books in print can usually be purchased as readily as they can be borrowed. Rarely does a junior college student need an out-of-print book desperately enough to justify an interlibrary loan transaction. This service can be of great value to faculty members, however, and its use for their benefit should be encouraged.

Circumstances may justify interlibrary borrowing for adult members of the local community, especially if there is no strong public library available. This is a service which will help to build good will for the college among local citizens. However, interlibrary borrowing is a

### *Readers' Services*

privilege which must never be abused by a borrowing library. Scrupulous care should be used in verifying titles requested and in returning titles borrowed within the loan period.

Readers' services to members of the local community should not end with an occasional procurement of a book from another library. A majority of our junior colleges are supported in large part by local taxation and as a result have a special obligation to their communities. Part of this obligation can and should be discharged by the library through the provision of readers' services to members of the community. These services are often of great benefit to a community, being unique in many cases, i.e., unavailable from any other source. James L. Wattenbarger, writing of the growth of junior colleges in Florida, observed: In many sections of the state, the organization of a junior college in the community has brought opportunities for cultural advantages to communities in a manner not previously possible. . . . In almost all communities the junior colleges provide a type of research collection which has not hitherto been available to the community.<sup>29</sup>

The library profession, therefore, finds a tremendous challenge in the junior college. First, the junior college librarian faces demands from the student body, which often consist of first and second year college students with all their needs, plus vocational students with no interest in further college training but with wide needs for library service never the less, plus adults who are returning to college for training they had missed.


Next, the junior college librarian faces demands from his faculty, which in most cases includes both instructors of academic courses with all their divergent interests, and technical education instructors in a wide variety of specialized fields. In addition, the librarian serving a junior college may have requests from the local community to render service relating to books and reading. Surely, if he makes a conscientious effort to organize and operate a library program which supplies the needs of his clientele for readers' services, he will be guaranteed a lifetime free from the boredom of inaction!

### *References*

1. Hankins, Frank. "Loan Policy, Del Mar College Library." Appended to *Del Mar College New Accessions, October, 1963*. (Mimeographed.)
2. National Society for the Study of Education. *The Fifty-fifth Yearbook: Part 1, The Public Junior College*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1956, p. 69.
3. Wattenbarger, James L. "The Place of the Junior College Library in the Community," *Florida Libraries*, 13:5-10, Sept. 1962.



4. Hirsch, Felix. "Goals for the Nineteen-Sixties: Significance of the New ALA Standards for Junior College Libraries," *Junior College Journal*, 31:136, Nov. 1960.
5. Association of College and Research Libraries, Committee on Standards. "Standards for Junior College Libraries," *College and Research Libraries*, 21:200-206, May 1960.
6. Harris, Marion D. "The Reference Department of Los Angeles City College Library," *Junior College Journal*, 29:222, Dec. 1958.
7. Tanis, Norman. "The Library as a Part of Industrial Education," *Industrial Arts and Vocational Education*, 50:17-19, April 1961.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 19.
9. Wallace, James O. Letter dated November 16, 1963.
10. Johnson, B. Lamar. *The Librarian and the Teacher in General Education*. Chicago, American Library Association, 1948.
11. Balanoff, Neal. "James M. Wood Learning Center, A Saturation Experiment at Stephens College," *Audiovisual Instruction*, 8:226-229, April 1963.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 226.
13. Carpenter, Marjorie. "Building a Philosophy of Learning Into a Library," *ALA Bulletin*, 55:173, Feb. 1961.
14. Harris, *op. cit.*, p. 222.
15. Scarborough, Ruth. Letter dated December 5, 1963.
16. Trinkner, Charles L. Letter dated November 21, 1963.
17. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. *Library Statistics of College and Universities, 1961-62, Institutional Data*. Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963, pp. 32, 50.
18. American Council on Education. *American Junior Colleges*. 6th ed. Washington, The Council, 1963.
19. Harvey, John F. "The Role of the Junior College Library in Classroom Instruction," *Junior College Journal*, 32:441-447, April 1962.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 446.
21. Pierson, Robert M. "Two Aspects of Readers' Services Areas: Recommendations to Library Planners," *College and Research Libraries*, 23:400, Sept. 1962.
22. "Association of College . . .," *op. cit.*, p. 202.
23. Gwynn, Stanley E. "The Liberal Arts Function of the University Library," *Library Quarterly*, 24:316, Oct. 1954.
24. Deale, H. Vail. "Our Responsibilities to the College Undergraduate," *ALA Bulletin*, 53:501, June 1959.
25. Knapp, Patricia B. "A Suggested Program of College Instruction in the Use of the Library," *Library Quarterly*, 26:224-231, July 1956.
26. Sheehan, Sister Helen, S.N.D. *The Small College Library*. Westminster, Md., The Newman Press, 1963, p. 110.
27. American Library Association, Library Technology Project. *Study of Circulation Control Systems*. Chicago, American Library Association, 1961.
28. "General Interlibrary Loan Code, 1952," *College and Research Libraries*, 13:350-358, Oct. 1952.
29. Wattenbarger, *op. cit.*, p. 9.



# The Library's Place in the Junior College

W. WILEY SCOTT

THIS PAPER rests on two basic postulates: that all junior college libraries, while different, have a common set of characteristics which gives them a degree of similarity, and that the effectiveness of the library is contingent upon the fulfillment of a group of mutual obligations between the library and the other facets of the college community.

The terms used in the title should be defined before the discussion proceeds. The library is the agency within the college concerned with aiding the college in the fulfillment of its objectives by the pursuit, dissemination and preservation of recorded information. Use of the term will imply its four dimensions, viz., staff, resources, services, and facilities. The junior college is "a post-high school educational institution offering a 2-year program either of a terminal nature or as preparation for further training. . . ." <sup>1</sup> Hereafter it will be referred to as the college. By "place" is meant the relationship of the library to the rest of the college.

In order to gain some insight into the philosophy, practice, and thinking of junior college librarians on the subject, a survey has been made, involving one hundred junior colleges, or one out of every seven in the United States. It was a random sample based on the sixth edition of *American Junior Colleges*.<sup>2</sup> Each librarian was asked to fill out a questionnaire and to give additional comments if he desired. Information from the questionnaire will be inserted from time to time, along with the stated references.

The first relationship to be noted between the library and the college is a legal relationship. Any organization of higher education has its basis in some form of corporate charter. The junior college owes its existence either to acts of the state legislature or to state laws in which provisions are made for the establishment of institutions of

Mr. Scott was formerly Librarian, Sinclair College, Dayton, Ohio, and is now Catalog Librarian, Albion College, Albion, Michigan.

higher education. The college library is provided for in the by-laws, articles of incorporation, or the college charter (or by whatever name such a document is known). The role and functions of the library are generally spelled out in the institutional handbook or catalog.<sup>3</sup> Of the one hundred librarians who responded to the survey, fifty-one said that in the by-laws—or whatever the document was called—the library was mentioned. Twenty-seven were not certain, and twelve said that it was not so mentioned.

The next relationship is that of the library and the academic community. Academic community implies an element of physical proximity, but much more is involved, however, because the members of the academic community may not reside in a given locale. By definition, the academic community consists of the members of the college family or group, the administration, faculty, students, and in some cases wives and families of the faculty members. To state it another way, the academic community is composed of the persons whom the library is obligated to serve. The main concern of the library will be the students, the faculty, and the administration (but not necessarily in that order). To each of these groups the library has a definite responsibility.

The student body of the junior college may be divided into two broad groups: terminal and university parallel students.<sup>4</sup> Another division would separate them into full-time, part-time, and special. The terminal student will end his formal education with the end of the second year of college. It is to be hoped, however, that this will not be the end of his education. The library must acquaint such a student with the vast store of information to be found in graphic form. It should further enable him to be familiar with the literature of his subject field so that professional competence can be maintained, and he can take his proper place in the social order. To the student who will continue his education in a four-year college or university, the library has an additional responsibility. Without overlooking any of the above mentioned factors, the library must implant in the student a set of sound habits of library use. The librarian should be sensitive to the needs of the students. Each student should be made to feel that the library exists for the fulfillment of his educational needs. The faculty must also work closely with the library staff to bring about this relationship.

The variation in the intellectual level of the faculty and of the students will result in a relationship with the library which will differ,

### *The Library's Place in the Junior College*

but not too vastly. In his book, *The Community College in Action*, Peter Sammartino reports, regarding the position of the faculty in the institution, "It is the chief business of any teacher to give the student zest for purposeful activity whether it be in the art of living or in earning a living."<sup>5</sup> The faculty is the mainspring of the college instructional program and if the instruction is to be successful, it is imperative that the faculty give vitality and diversity to their instructional efforts. In addition to being a coefficient to the teaching process and activity, the library should perform for the faculty certain specific functions.

The alert teacher is ever seeking new approaches and instructional methods. He will be concerned about new trends and new ideas which will improve his class presentations. By working with the librarian, such a person will be able to obtain materials in the field of education which will aid him in the accomplishment of his aims. The library staff is responsible for working with faculty members to acquire materials which will aid in their preparation for classes. This presupposes not only the literature of a given field but literature which discusses methods as well. The librarian, when preparing the budget, should take into consideration materials which will be used only by the faculty in their preparation for classes, and to this end see that funds are available.

In addition to materials for class preparation, the library should be the source of some professional reading for the faculty. Due to the rapidity with which ideas and philosophies regarding various subjects tend to change, the library must cooperate with the faculty to see that professional literature is available when needed. Much of the professional literature will be in the form of periodicals which will represent a considerable expenditure. This, again, must be taken into consideration by the librarian when making up the budget.

Finally, the library should be the source, for the faculty, of materials for research and study, and this may or may not overlap with what has been called professional reading. In this area, interlibrary loan is often an asset, but cannot be expected completely to fill the need. The librarian should set aside a part of the budget for this seemingly little used area of the library collection.

In this context it is necessary to say a word about the faculty library committee and its functions. Among the respondents to the questionnaire, ninety said that they had a library committee. This committee is appointed by either the president or the dean (in every case the

person to whom the librarian reported) in eighty-eight cases. The librarian in the remaining two cases had the privilege of selecting his own committee. Seventy said that the committee had proven to be helpful, nine did not answer the question, and eleven said that it was not helpful. Librarians stated that they received assistance in the allocation of the budget to various departments, in book selection in various special subject fields, and in effective liaison between the faculty and the librarian. The library committee can be of assistance to the librarian in other ways. It can keep him informed of the needs and dissatisfactions of the faculty,<sup>6</sup> and can assist in the promotion of the use of the services of the library.<sup>7</sup> The library committee was generally viewed with favor by the librarians in the survey. However, among the comments which accompanied the responses were such statements as: the library committee members show little interest, have axes to grind, try to usurp all the budget for their departments, and often try to wield authority which they do not have.

The college library exists for the purpose of aiding the college in the fulfillment of its objectives. In this respect, the library serves the college in three ways: as a teaching agency, as a materials center, and as a reading and study center. As a teaching agency, the library has the responsibility of continuing classroom instruction, in one sense of the word; but more realistically the library, along with the classroom instructor, must provide also the beginning of instruction. Probably the one most effective method of achieving this is the orientation period. To be effective it must be organized carefully and take place both inside and outside the library.<sup>8</sup> To state it simply, teaching is the process of making known to a student some fact or body of facts by explanation, example, or general exposure to said facts. Teaching on the part of the library, as is the case in the classroom, must be both relevant and appealing if it is to be successful. The responsibility of the library staff is to teach a working knowledge of the tools and facilities of the library.<sup>9</sup>

In addition to or, more specifically, along with the teaching function, the library serves as a materials center for the academic community. Books, periodicals, and pamphlets form the well-established stock of the library, but in addition to the library should include whatever materials are best suited to aid in the achievement of the objectives of the library and of the academic community in the instructional process. Among the more conventional types of non-print items is the vast store of audio-visual materials which is irreplaceable in the in-

### *The Library's Place in the Junior College*

structional program. More and more the trend is to place the audio-visual materials under the auspices of the library. The American Library Association, in drawing up the standards for junior college libraries, included this as a part of the library collection.<sup>10</sup> This is not to say that the library should vie with any other agency of the college for control of the audio-visual materials, but in the absence of such other agency the library should take the initiative in providing audio-visual materials for the institution. In order that the service in this as well as other areas may be efficient and effective, adequate provision must be made in terms of staff and budget, and the same high standards should prevail in the selection of these materials as of books. Again must be mentioned the element of faculty cooperation.

Finally the library functions as a reading and study center. In spite of the criticism of librarians that the library is too often a study hall where the students read their textbooks, it is often a very necessary service. One survey revealed that some 50 per cent of the students who came to the library came for the purpose of studying their own textbooks.<sup>11</sup> The other 50 per cent of the library users are the main concern of the library in its attempt to function as a reading and study center. Some junior colleges are commuters' colleges rather than residential institutions, and the library may provide the only place where the student can do class preparation while at school. The faculty must work with the student in encouraging independent study and with the librarian to aid in the provision of library materials which will make for recreational reading as well. One factor which has and will continue to change the pattern of library use as a reading center is the rapid production of paperback books.<sup>12</sup> With the advent of many classics in sturdy and inexpensive paper-bound books, it is easy for the student to build his own personal library.<sup>13</sup> In spite of the advance of the paperback, the library must continue to be a reading center for the students of the college. One of the most effective ways in which this may be accomplished is to provide and call attention to new and less well-known materials. The library's objective is to aid the college in the fulfillment of its objective which is in effect to help the student take his place in society. For a democratic society presupposes an informed citizenry.

In discussing the importance of interpreting the services of the library to its clientele, it is necessary to go back to an axiom of unknown origin: "If a man builds a better mouse trap than his neighbor, he rids himself of mice; if he advertises the mouse trap, he rids the world of

mice." Having provided the right materials for students and faculty, having performed the function of teaching, and having served as a reading center, it is the obligation of the librarian to interpret services of the library to the clientele. When interpretation is involved, no element of the academic community can be overlooked or underestimated, and it is better to begin not with the students but with the administration and especially the faculty. They are, after all, the more stable elements of the academic community and can be most instrumental in spreading the word around.

In the present survey, 90 per cent of the librarians said that their mechanisms for communication with the administration consisted not only of annual or semiannual reports, but direct contact with the president or dean to whom they were responsible. The members of the faculty and administration are usually busy people, and an effort to keep them informed will be both appreciated and helpful. The librarian should use this contact with the president or dean both to keep him informed and to give him an idea of the needs of the library. With the faculty, the methods of interpretation will be different but no less intense. The librarian will not only keep them informed of new acquisitions and resources, but will solicit from them assistance in making known to students the services which the library is able to offer. The faculty can be of considerable assistance in stimulating and guiding students in their use of the library.<sup>14</sup>

The mechanisms for interpreting library services will vary from one institution to another. Probably among the most important is that of personal acquaintance. Where the college staff is small and enjoys an intimate relationship, this can be effected without too much difficulty or effort. With a larger staff it will require more effort, and other means must be used for the communication of information to the various departments and members of the academic community. Some of these are the library handbook, the annual report, the college catalog, the college newspaper, lists of new books, a library bulletin, book displays, and exhibits.<sup>15</sup> It is often effective (as well as good public relations) to ask members of various academic departments to participate in the preparation of displays concerning their fields of study.

Instruction in the use of the library is also of importance in the interpretation of the library's services to its users. The curriculum may not provide for a course in the use of the library, but by working closely with the faculty it is often possible to obtain a few units of class time in which to provide instruction in the use of the library.

### *The Library's Place in the Junior College*

This formal instruction is often very important, since many students come from high schools where the library and its potential have not been sufficiently emphasized. The college librarian with his training is qualified and often very competent in instruction.<sup>16</sup>

The junior college is often called the community college because its major function is service to the community.<sup>17</sup> Therefore the college library too is concerned with service to the general as well as the academic community. Although its first obligation is to the academic community, the college librarian should seek in every way to co-operate with other librarians in the community. The positive values of such cooperation cannot be over-emphasized. In 76 per cent of the libraries surveyed, library cooperation was not only endorsed but was a reality. Twenty per cent of the librarians said that their facilities were open to the general public, and many of the respondents felt that interlibrary cooperation should not be limited to a given town, city, or village, but should extend as far and wide as is practical.

Achieving cooperation between librarians of a given area begins by becoming familiar with the needs of one's neighbors. Once needs and interests are known, the next step is very often a matter of achieving some form of loose organization which will serve the purpose. In time, union catalogs may be formed or sometimes union lists of serial holdings. Questions from business and industry should be welcomed, and the college librarian should take an active part in the community and seek to interpret the role of his library to the general community.<sup>18</sup> The junior college library should become a member of a team of libraries committed to the provision of better library services for all.<sup>19</sup>

By way of summary, it may be said that the library's place in the junior college is the center. This does not claim or imply that it occupies a superior position to any other entity of the college, but by the same token it does not occupy an inferior one either. The effectiveness of the library is based upon a kind of reciprocal cooperation between the library and all other parts of the academic community.

### *References*

1. Good, Carter V., ed. *Dictionary of Education*. 2d ed. New York, McGraw-Hill Company, Inc., 1959, p. 305.
2. Gleazer, Edmund J., ed. *American Junior Colleges*. 6th ed. New York, Washington, American Council on Education, 1963.
3. Lyle, Guy R. *The Administration of the College Library*. 3d ed. New York, The H. W. Wilson Company, 1961, p. 30.



4. White, Ruth W. "The Role of the Community College Library," *Junior College Journal*, 23:109-111, Oct. 1962.
5. Sammartino, Peter. *Community College in Action*. Rutherford, N.J., Fairleigh Dickinson College Press, 1950, p. 101.
6. Branscomb, Harvie. *Teaching with Books*. Chicago, American Library Association, 1940, p. 193.
7. Lyle, *op. cit.*, pp. 39-40.
8. Robinson, Lowell. "The Role of the College Librarian," *Improving College and University Teaching*, 10:72-73, Spring 1962; and Jones, Robert C. "Administrative Relationships of the Library and the Junior College," *Junior College Journal*, 29:324-328, Feb. 1959.
9. Shou, Stephens T. "Teaching Function of a University Library," *Improving College and University Teaching*, 10:69-71, Spring 1962.
10. "The New Junior College Library Standards," *ALA Bulletin*, 55:155-160, Feb. 1961.
11. Lyle, Guy R. *The President, the Professor and the College Library*. New York, The H. W. Wilson Company, 1963, p. 55.
12. Lash, Henry. "The Paperback Revolution and the Junior College," *Junior College Journal*, 31:402-403, March 1961.
13. Strout, Donald E. "Paperback Books—Boon or Bane?" *The Nature and Development of the Library Collection* (Allerton Park Institute No. 3). Champaign, Illinois, University of Illinois Library School, 1956, p. 40.
14. Jones, *op. cit.*, p. 326.
15. Lyle, *The Administration of the College Library*, pp. 357-370.
16. Robinson, *op. cit.*, p. 72.
17. Menefee, Audrey G. "There's a Meeting Here Tonight," *Junior College Journal*, 31:387-390, March 1961.
18. White, *op. cit.*, p. 111.
19. Wattenbarger, James L. "The Place of the Junior College Library in the Community," *Florida Libraries*, 13:5-10, Sept. 1962.

## Evaluation Trends

FELIX E. HIRSCH

MORE THAN ONE-THIRD of a century has passed since the junior college librarians of the country got together for the first time in an official fashion. That was their round-table meeting at the American Library Association Conference in Los Angeles in June 1930. At that time they agreed on standards designed to assure the struggling junior college libraries of better days to come. The minimum requirements for libraries serving up to 500 students were 10,000 well selected volumes (with an initial book stock of 5,000); for up to 1,000 students, 15,000 volumes; and for more than 1,000 students, not less than 20,000 volumes. There were precise prescriptions in dollars and cents for the size of the book budget. The minimum staff for a library serving 500 students or less was to consist of two professional librarians.<sup>1</sup>

Thirty years later, the Committee on Standards of the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL), arrived, after long deliberations, at a set of standards which were not much more demanding than what had seemed proper to the junior college librarians in 1930. Nevertheless, some administrators and even some librarians thought that the committee had asked for too much. In a way, this indicates that the library in the two-year college, while its number has grown enormously, has not enjoyed the same good fortune as did its counterpart in the four-year institution. While libraries in liberal arts and state colleges have witnessed a phenomenal development of resources, rapid growth of staff, and a vast improvement of physical plant in the last generation, many junior college libraries are still struggling to meet their most elementary needs. It is all the more important that every possible effort be made by the profession to implement the ALA Standards for Junior College Libraries.

Felix E. Hirsch is Librarian and Professor of History at Trenton (N.J.) State College. He was chairman of the Association of College and Research Libraries Committee on Standards from 1957 to 1963.

The Junior College Section of ACRL agreed on a set of standards in 1956, after extended discussions. But the Board of Directors of ACRL felt a need for their reexamination and turned the document over to the ACRL Committee on Standards at the ALA conference in Washington, in June 1959. The committee chairman was instructed to proceed with deliberate speed, since the standards had been in the making for a long time. An additional reason for the reworking was that the new standards, as far as possible, should run parallel to the ALA Standards for College Libraries which had been prepared by the same committee and had been well received.

The committee began to work immediately on its new assignment. Several leaders among the junior college librarians of the country were added to its ranks, such as Ruth E. Scarborough (Centenary College for Women), Norman E. Tanis (Henry Ford Community College), Orlin C. Spicer (Morton Junior College), and Lottie M. Skidmore (Joliet Junior College), who served in an advisory capacity. Many other junior college librarians were consulted in regard to various crucial points. The committee was also able to use the most recent nationwide statistics of junior college libraries prior to their publication.

In November 1959, the committee held a two-day work session in Chicago at ALA headquarters. All members were present, including those from other types of academic libraries: Helen M. Brown (Wellesley College), Donald O. Rod (State College of Iowa), and Helen Welch (University of Illinois). The committee drafted a new set of standards which was submitted for suggestions and criticisms to presidents, deans, and librarians of junior colleges, executive secretaries of accrediting agencies, and leaders in the field of librarianship. The committee greatly benefited from the advice and constructive comments, but recognized that the final responsibility for the standards rested with its own members.

In January 1960, a second draft was prepared which embodied many of the critical observations received. This draft was presented to the ACRL Board of Directors at the midwinter meeting in 1960 and was adopted unanimously. The intent of the new standards was then explained by the present writer at a meeting of the Junior College Library Section, at the ALA conference in Montreal on June 20, 1960. The observations were warmly received, and no hostile word was uttered in the extended discussion.<sup>2</sup> The writer met the same positive reception for his presentation of the committee's work, wherever he

### *Evaluation Trends*

spoke about the standards to junior college librarians, e.g., in Maryland, New York State, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey. On the last-mentioned occasion, he shared the platform with Dean John Harvey of the Graduate Library School at Drexel Institute, who had visited many junior college libraries. In commenting on the Standards, Harvey said that “. . . they suggest a good level of service higher than that now obtained by most of these libraries. All junior college administrators and faculty members should improve their libraries to meet these standards.”<sup>3</sup> Harvey urged that the Standards should be applied in the proper spirit. He concluded: “If a spirit of cooperation is missing and there is no eagerness to improve the library’s usefulness, then these standards will be useless.”<sup>3</sup>

This “spirit of cooperation” has been lacking at times. It cannot be denied that there are still junior college administrators who, in spite of professions to the contrary, do not believe in the importance of high-level library service for their institutions. To some of them, the Standards seem unreasonable in their demands. Instead of developing strong collections of their own, they would rather place the burden of providing adequate service on the public library in town or on other well-stocked libraries in the area. It is deplorable that some major treatises on the junior college, written by noted experts in the field of education and administration, do not stress the need for good library service. In fact, some of the most recent works—like Leland L. Medsker’s *The Junior College: Progress and Prospect*<sup>4</sup> and Ralph R. Fields’ *The Community College Movement*<sup>5</sup>—do not even refer to the library in their index. This would be unthinkable in any good book on the four-year college.

The new Standards were designed to fight this spirit of neglect or outright hostility. Like its companion piece, the ALA Standards for College Libraries, the document is written in readable, concise language so that it should not be cumbersome to busy administrators because of wordiness or excessive technical detail. Its emphasis is on quality. On the other hand, some quantitative suggestions are included since such yardsticks are indispensable, especially in weaker institutions. The figures proposed, as for the size of the collections, etc., were chosen after careful deliberation. It is not expected that they will be attained overnight, especially in a recently established institution, but they do provide a reasonable goal for at least the 1960’s, if not beyond. It is important to note that the new Standards are meant to serve the entire country. There should not be separate standards for individual

regions or states, nor should there be a basic difference of quality between public and private, religious and non-sectarian two-year institutions as far as their libraries are concerned. In general, the new Standards are flexible enough to meet various situations which are bound to arise in the several types of junior colleges, but they are based on firm principles.

Today, it is more important than at any previous time to have strong junior college libraries. The reasons for this, which were uppermost in the minds of the ACRL Committee on Standards, should be obvious now also to others, viz., enrollments are rapidly increasing, academic programs are becoming more varied, and emphasis on independent study and on general education is growing. Students who expect to transfer to four-year institutions should be exposed to a well-rounded collection in their first two years so that they may compete on even terms with their fellow students in a senior college; this writer has observed the importance of this point again and again when dealing with bewildered transfer students in his own college. While some persons say it is "unrealistic" to aim for such strong libraries, the Committee on Standards believed that this was the opportune time to ask for them. The American public has never been as keenly aware of the need for better support of higher education as in the past few years. Sputnik opened the public's eyes to the dangers of complacency and mediocrity in education, if it did nothing else.

The junior college library of tomorrow should be well enough supported that it need not rely on the charity of other institutions for the performance of its essential services. This, of course, should not militate against intelligent cooperation between neighboring libraries to make the dollars spent by each of them go further; in fact, the Standards stress the desirability of such collaboration.

The essence of the new Standards is the concept of the library as the intellectual powerhouse of the junior college and, as a corollary, the concept of the junior college librarian as an educator. The junior college librarian must be a person deserving to be accepted as an equal by the teaching faculty. He (or she) should command respect by an evident deep concern for good books and for educational problems. At one time librarians could afford to be primarily custodians of their collections, more worried about circulation records and gadgets than about the inside of their books, but today broadly educated, widely interested librarians are needed.

The size of the library staff will, of course, depend upon the struc-

### *Evaluation Trends*

ture and the financial support of the institution, on the type of curriculum or curricula offered, and on the prevailing teaching methods. However, no adequate service is imaginable unless there are at least two professional librarians available. They usually have to cover a long schedule of working hours, because many junior colleges operate evening divisions; on the other hand, it is essential that a librarian be on duty at all times the library is open for full service. The executive secretary of one regional accrediting agency felt that junior college libraries actually need a minimum of three professional librarians just as much as the libraries of four-year colleges do. The ACRL Committee on Standards, however, believed that the operation of the junior college library is usually less complex than that of the senior college library and that two professional librarians would suffice. Although this suggested minimum size is the same as that espoused by the Junior College Round-Table in 1930, it did arouse the criticism of one junior college expert. B. Lamar Johnson questioned the figure, because a majority of junior college libraries (more than three out of five) had only a single librarian.<sup>6</sup> The Committee on Standards had been aware of this fact, but considered a junior college library with but one professional librarian totally inadequate on principle for the service to be performed. On this point, as on some others, it was vigorously upheld by Robert T. Jordan, a staff member of the Council on Library Resources and a former California junior college librarian. He stated, on the basis of his own experiences:

I would like to emphasize that conditions in the average junior college library today are deplorable, if not shocking. We are faced with this question—should a group setting up desirable standards relate itself to existing, grossly inadequate conditions, or to standards accepted by expert opinion as necessary? <sup>7</sup>

Dean Harvey concurred that “this standard is a modest one.” With such staffs as he had seen on his visits to many junior colleges, “. . . librarians could come nowhere near achieving the quality of service suggested in the standards.” <sup>8</sup>

The Committee on Standards did not follow the example of the Junior College Round-Table of 1930 which had proposed specific minimum budgets; intentionally it excluded any reference to dollar figures. It reasoned that the purchasing power of our currency is subject to so many factors that it would be unwise to be committed to specific sums. Who would dare to predict in this era of constantly ris-

ing publishing costs how many books could be purchased for \$100 two or three years hence? Therefore it seemed advisable to select a percentage figure, as had proved to be an effective procedure in the ALA Standards for College Libraries. The same figure of 5 per cent of the institution's general and educational budget was chosen. This did not seem excessive in view of the fact that the median figure (published in *College and Research Libraries*)<sup>9</sup> was 4 per cent. The committee believed it was a reasonable goal to raise the figure by one per cent over the next several years; junior college librarians consulted recently are fully agreed on this point. Of course, institutions which did not support their libraries properly in the past or are now expanding their curricular offerings rapidly, may find it necessary to invest considerably more than 5 per cent to bring library service up to the desired level. This is an important factor which should not be overlooked in planning the library budget for a period of years ahead.

It is always difficult to determine the size of a book collection which is needed to serve the curricular needs and the general reading interests of a good junior college. There is no miraculous formula that the committee could have proposed. But the experience of good libraries, such as those at Bradford, Briarcliff, Centenary, and Colby Junior Colleges, indicates that at least 20,000 well-chosen volumes should be available in institutions with less than 1,000 students. This was also the figure suggested by many of the junior college librarians whom the committee consulted. The committee was fully aware of the fact the median at the time was only slightly above 10,000 volumes—a fact which B. Lamar Johnson stressed in his criticism—and that there are some states in which the average collection then barely reached 4,000 volumes. But even if one takes 10,000 volumes as a basis, it was not unrealistic to propose 20,000 volumes as the goal for a decade, because many junior college librarians agreed that an annual accession rate of about 1,000 volumes would be reasonable. It is interesting that Charles L. Trinkner, reporting on the Florida situation, arrived independently at the same figure of 20,000 well-chosen volumes as the desirable minimum, and added that it “. . . should be available to the student body as soon as possible after the institution is open for its academic business.”<sup>10</sup> Trinkner also took the leadership in compiling the new list, *Basic Books for Junior College Libraries: 20,000 Vital Titles*.<sup>11</sup> This list represents a great step toward the implementation of the Standards at a time when six out of every ten junior college libraries still have less than 20,000 volumes each. By referring to this list, it

### *Evaluation Trends*

should be much easier to give junior college library collections the vitality and strength which many of them lack. It is gratifying that *Basic Books* will be kept up to date by supplements, since some earlier lists of considerable merit lost their usefulness over the years for lack of such a device. Naturally, some aspects of the list have not escaped occasional criticism, but this does not detract from its value as a pioneering effort. The list can now be supplemented also by the use of *Choice* and of *New Books Appraised* in the *Library Journal*.

The Standards try to be as explicit as possible regarding the library collection; the emphasis clearly is on raising its quality. First of all, the need for a strong reference collection is underscored. It should include standard works in all major fields of knowledge, far beyond the limits of the curriculum actually offered at the time. Indexes, abstract journals, and subject bibliographies will be important, even when the collection in the areas concerned is not very rich, because faculty and students have in this way at least an approach to materials that could be secured by interlibrary loan or some form of duplication. It is fortunate that the new list of *Basic Books* includes 300 reference works; thus it goes far beyond the practical hints offered in a long footnote to the Standards. Next, the library should be well equipped to support the requirements of the classroom by a great variety of suitable literature. Otherwise textbook teaching, with all its educational shortcomings, is inevitable. The collection should also contain enough attractive, timely, and thought-provoking books of a more general nature to develop in students the life-time habit of good reading. The fact that students can now buy a wealth of high-caliber paperbacks in many fields of knowledge at a reasonable price does not relieve the library of its obligation to do its full share in this respect. Finally, the need of instructors to keep abreast of the progress of scholarship should not be overlooked; a certain generosity along these lines may pay heavy dividends in the long run.

Every college library today is faced with the problem of duplication. As enrollments increase, the need for two or three or even four copies of key titles becomes imperative, especially when they are required reading in several courses or several sections. This pressure will grow when the number of students exceeds 1,000. The Standards suggest that the book stock should be enlarged by 5,000 volumes for every additional 500 students; this makes duplication possible while slightly expanding the number of titles represented in the basic collection. Of course, it would not be advisable even in a very large



junior college to buy any textbooks wholesale for the library collection; "key titles" are treatises of much higher merit than that. No book collection can be kept "alive," unless library staff and faculty join hands in a regular systematic effort of weeding obsolete materials. Librarians are often too timid in this respect. They do not realize that many beginning college students assume naively that their library has only good books. Failure to weed will, therefore, be harmful indeed and lead to many misunderstandings.

Trinkner's list of *Basic Books* contains 150 periodical titles; they are all geared to the needs of the junior college. This writer would like to state his firm belief that it does not do any harm to subscribe to some journals that might look "too scholarly," for it is a good experience for students to have to make an intellectual effort to master relevant information or a novel point of view. An ever-present danger that should be guarded against is that of parochialism; some journals from abroad will have a salutary influence. It should be noted that the Standards urge junior college librarians to adhere firmly to the stand of the American Library Association on the subject of censorship. It is essential that the junior college library provide its readers with materials which present all sides of controversial issues. We must stand up against timidity and expediency in our own ranks at a time when so many public pressures are directed against courageous librarians in their quest of truth.

As one travels through this country, he finds only too often (although there are some remarkable exceptions) that the junior college library is in an unattractive corner of a building, in two or three classrooms which have been "converted" to library use. The books are housed on overcrowded shelves, and the seating capacity is low. The writer's observations gibe with those of Dean Harvey who praises some beautiful modern buildings he has seen, but "on the other hand, several of the libraries had physical facilities which were miserable, shabbier, smaller, and poorer than most high-school libraries."<sup>12</sup> One might wonder who would wish to sit down in such cheerless quarters; but many students, all of them commuters, have no other place on campus in which to do their research and their serious studying. Thus they are doubly at a disadvantage as compared with resident students in good four-year colleges who have both nice dormitory rooms and an attractive library building at their disposal. In the light of these considerations, the seating capacity of 25 per cent of the student body, which the Standards suggest, is not at all extravagant. B. Lamar

### *Evaluation Trends*

Johnson took issue with this figure, pointing out that the median library seating capacity in the California junior colleges had been only 8 per cent in 1955/56. He felt that the proposal of 25 per cent was "... both unrealistic and unjustified for many—and some might hold most—junior colleges."<sup>13</sup> In his rebuttal, this writer made the point that the California figure did not provide any clue to the seating capacity these junior colleges ought to have, and that at least some California junior college librarians shared the views of the Committee on this matter. He concluded: "We must be realistic, not only in terms of what some junior college administrators believe is feasible, but also in terms of the learning process."<sup>14</sup> Nothing has happened since then to shake his belief that the Standards provide an adequate blueprint for the decade in this respect, even though they may not fulfill every librarian's desires nor please those old-line administrators who are not overly concerned with good library service. Among the outstanding junior college librarians across the country, there are still some who consider a seating capacity of 25 per cent rather high, while there are others who believe that the library should be able to accommodate one-third of the students at one time.

Perhaps the most important constructive effort to supplement the Standards has been that undertaken by the Standards and Criteria Committee of the ACRL Junior College Libraries Section, under the leadership of Norman E. Tanis. This Committee recently prepared "Guidelines for Establishing Junior College Libraries."<sup>15</sup> These "Guidelines" go into considerable detail; they are based on the experience of junior college librarians who have already established new libraries. The "Guidelines" would be of value to administrators and citizen groups who plan new institutions; they include sound advice and precise figures.

No consideration of standards and their implementation will be complete without discussing the question of how the actual quality of library service can be evaluated. There are so many factors to be appraised, if one aims at a fair verdict. Some of the evidence needs careful weighing, and it would be dangerous to draw hasty generalizations, e.g., from statistical records. In the typical open-shelf library, many reader activities can never be measured statistically. However, the per-capita circulation of books on two-week loan to students offers some valuable clues, if one analyzes it over a long period of time.<sup>16</sup> Some academic authorities, like Henry Wriston, President Emeritus of Brown University, consider this statistical information to be the

most important indicator of intellectual health on campus. There is also a degree of validity in some other figures, such as library attendance at various times, use of reserve books, reference questions unanswered, or book requests not filled. Generally speaking, librarians will be well advised not to overrate the significance of such statistical evidence; it is not fool-proof and might even be misleading.

Another approach is a check of the collection against standard lists. *Basic Books* should be a great help in this respect, but the checking of pertinent subject bibliographies of reasonable size could also be enlightening, like the *Concise Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature*, to give but one example. How many journals does the library subscribe to, which are indexed in *Readers' Guide*, *Applied Science and Technology Index*, etc.? Does the library own most of the titles included in Mary Barton's excellent compilation of *Reference Books*?<sup>17</sup> The answer to these and similar questions may provide the librarian with valuable ammunition in his struggle for better budgets and better service.

At some strategic moment the librarian should make an even bolder move. For instance, when he knows that an evaluation or reevaluation of his institution by its regional accrediting agency is forthcoming, he should go before the faculty and propose a joint survey of the library and all its facilities to ascertain whether the Standards have been met in most respects. At such a juncture, he can usually count on the moral backing of the administration and of the teaching faculty, especially if he has enlisted the active support of the faculty library committee in advance. There is nothing more fruitful and more revealing than such a self-study, undertaken in harmonious collaboration with book-minded faculty members, provided all steps are carefully planned.<sup>18</sup> Another benefit of this kind of self-survey is that the detailed library questionnaire, which usually forms part of the routine preceding the visit by a team of the accrediting agency, can be answered without much extra effort. The author has just followed this procedure once again at Trenton State College, with great success. And the librarian of San Antonio College (Texas), James O. Wallace, reports on an institutional self-study prior to the reevaluation of his college by the Southern Association:

The fact that A.L.A. had a set of standards which faculty members could use to evaluate the library, definitely was a prestige factor on our campus. I heard several members of the Library Committee almost brag that their work was so much easier than that of colleagues

### *Evaluation Trends*

on other committees, because of these "good" library standards and questions about the standards that they could follow.<sup>19</sup>

Finally, the librarian might propose to his authorities the appointment of an outside consultant, preferably a man or a woman with a nationwide reputation. Such an expert, coming in for a short period only, could perform some very important functions. Having critically examined many other comparable libraries, he may have some startling advice to offer for major improvements. This advice may be more graciously accepted, coming from a prominent outsider with no axe to grind than from the librarian. Such a consultant can render invaluable service, especially when a new library building is under consideration or when a master-plan for the long-range development of the library collections is to be designed. There is only one proviso: the consultant must be willing to take the time for a really careful analysis of the specific situation; no hasty verdict does any good.


The struggle for the Standards has been long, arduous, and at times acrimonious. This writer is happy to have shared in this endeavor, and believes it to be of vital importance to the whole field of higher education. For clearly the status quo is not good enough in this era of rapid educational changes in America, of which the junior college is the most characteristic symbol.<sup>20</sup>

### *References*

1. Stone, Ermine. *The Junior College Library*. Chicago, American Library Association, 1932. (See Appendix 1 for full text of standards.)
2. Hirsch, Felix E. "Goals for the Nineteen-Sixties," *Junior College Journal*, 31:135-139, Nov. 1960.
3. Harvey, John F. "The Role of the Junior College Library in Classroom Instruction," *Junior College Journal*, 32:445, April 1962.
4. Medsker, Leland L. *The Junior College: Progress and Prospect*. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1960.
5. Fields, Ralph R. *The Community College Movement*. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1962.
6. Johnson, B. Lamar. "The New Junior College Library Standards," *ALA Bulletin*, 55:155-160, Feb. 1961; Hirsch, Felix E. "How High Should We Aim?" *ALA Bulletin*, 55:160-162, Feb. 1961 (In this article, the other side of the question is presented.); and Jordan, Robert T. "Goals, Not Standards," *ALA Bulletin*, 55:565-567, June 1961 (Jordan supports strongly the position taken by Hirsch in defense of the Standards.)
7. *Ibid.*, (Jordan), p. 565.
8. Harvey, *op. cit.*, p. 446.
9. "College and University Library Statistics, 1958/59," *College and Research Libraries*, 21:25-87, Jan. 1960.

FELIX E. HIRSCH

10. Trinkner, Charles L. "Library Trends in Florida's Junior Colleges," *Junior College Journal*, 30:376, March 1960.
11. Trinkner, Charles L. *Basic Books for Junior College Libraries: 20,000 Vital Titles*. Northport, Ala., Colonial Press, 1963.
12. Harvey, *op. cit.*, p. 446.
13. Johnson, *op. cit.*, p. 160.
14. Hirsch, *op. cit.*, p. 162.
15. American Library Association, Association of College and Research Libraries, Junior College Libraries Section, Standards and Criteria Committee. "Guidelines for Establishing Junior College Libraries," *College and Research Libraries*, 24:501-505, Nov. 1963.
16. Knapp, Patricia. *College Teaching and the College Library* (ACRL Monograph No. 23). Chicago, American Library Association, 1959.
17. Barton, Mary. *Reference Books; A Brief Guide for Students and Other Users of the Library*. 5th ed. Baltimore, Enoch Pratt Library, 1962.
18. Tanis, Norman E., and Jacobs, Karl J. "Strengthening the Junior College Library Through Use of the A.L.A. Standards." (Copies are available from Norman E. Tanis, Henry Ford Community College Library, 5101 Evergreen, Dearborn, Mich.); and Tanis, Norman E. "Implementing the Junior College Library Standards," *College and Research Libraries*, 22:130-133, March 1961.
19. Wallace, James O. Letter dated Dec. 12, 1963.
20. The author gratefully acknowledges the good suggestions and valuable comments received from librarians of junior colleges; among them are Catherine Cardew, Briarcliff College, New York; Shirley Edsall, Corning Community College, New York; Hubert E. Hall, formerly at San Jose City College, California; Monique B. Harriton, Los Angeles City College, California; Elizabeth Martin, Foothill College, Los Altos Hills, California; Sister Mary Consuelo, C.R.S.M., Gwynedd-Mercy Junior College, Pennsylvania; Frances L. Meals, Colby Junior College, New Hampshire; William J. Nichols, Dutchess County Community College, New York; Peter Simoglou, Northern Essex-Community College, Massachusetts; James O. Wallace, San Antonio College, Texas; and Florence C. Wilmer, Catonsville Community College, Maryland. However, the responsibility for this paper which sums up the ideas he has presented in many places over the last half-dozen years, remains entirely the author's.



# Building and Equipment Trends: I

JOHN F. HARVEY

THIS IS A VERY ACTIVE PERIOD for junior college library building. With the rapid development of new colleges, particularly community colleges, many new libraries are being constructed. This article will summarize the current status of junior college library building development, suggest certain trends existing in this field, and give examples of interesting new junior college library buildings. Both types of building programs will be covered, those in which the library has its own separate building and those in which the library shares quarters with other campus offices. Both public and private junior colleges will be included.

There is relatively little which is unique about the junior college; in most ways it is much like the four year college. Often campuses look almost identical. It is probably true, also, that there are relatively few trends unique in junior college library buildings. Most of the trends which exist in four-year college library buildings and in other kinds of junior college buildings no doubt exist also in junior college library buildings, so the serious student of such trends can be referred to them for helpful data.

Information on the essential steps in designing academic library buildings is covered in several pertinent titles listed in the references.<sup>1-7</sup> Furniture and equipment problems are covered well in two other sources.<sup>8-9</sup>

In particular, junior college library buildings and equipment have been covered by Ray Rowland in Chapter 4 of *Library Services for Junior Colleges*.<sup>10</sup> This chapter includes A. F. Kuhlman's *Data Needed to Plan a New College Library*, adapted for junior colleges, as well as the ACRL *Standards for Junior College Libraries*, the latter being a document basic for new building design in this field.

Theodore Samore, using U.S. Office of Education data, concluded in

---

The author is Dean, Graduate School of Library Science, Drexel Institute of Technology, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

1963 that the median age of public junior college library buildings in sixteen states was seven years, showing many relatively new buildings. In private junior colleges, however, the median building age was 33, a middle-aged figure, probably reflecting many cases of buildings shared with administration offices or classrooms or both.<sup>11</sup> Square footages per library were surprisingly small and thereby supported the previous conclusions of John Harvey concerning the inferior quality and quantity of the housing occupied by junior college libraries.<sup>12</sup>

Numerous academic library building trends exist, and some of those most pertinent to junior colleges are given in this section. Some of them are even, to a certain extent, peculiar to junior college libraries.

The history of many junior colleges shows the library to have been located in the administration building or else in a classroom building where it originally occupied a large room or a series of rooms. In 1958, a survey of a selected sample of smaller junior college libraries revealed that the library was separately housed in only 24 per cent of them.<sup>13</sup> Such a location creates noise and traffic problems, but is economical and accessible whether in an old mansion such as the Baptist Institute in Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania, or at Mohawk Valley Technical Institute in Utica, New York, where the entire college is in one building.

Often such a location, especially in the public junior college, is one which requires sharing not only larger buildings with other offices and classrooms, but also the library itself with high school students as at Independence Community College in Independence, Kansas, where grades 11, 12, 13, and 14 share the library.

With advancing enrollments and better financing, there is a trend toward a separate library building in keeping with the typical college campus plan. Such a change usually results in considerable increase in library floor space although it may also bring inferior accessibility for faculty and students.

An unusually large number of new buildings are being constructed in colleges only recently established. Obviously, this provides an excellent opportunity to take a fresh and imaginative approach to the problems of such libraries rather than the more traditional approach of the liberal arts college. It has influenced these libraries in the direction of modern architecture, and many are built along very modern designs. Often the entire campus carries out such a design. On the other hand, in such new colleges the library must be built without knowledge of the particular preferences and habits of the faculty, student body, and

### *Building and Equipment Trends: I*

administrative officials involved. Where pioneering approaches to library design problems are made, we can only hope that adequate testing procedures will be provided with which to judge the degree of success achieved.

Another trend is in the direction of the increased use of library building consultants and library planning committees to assist in planning and designing the building. While probably still not common in junior colleges, the consultant is making his influence felt in all kinds of other libraries. Recognition of the fact that building planning is a complex project has brought about the desirability of a coordinated approach to it which involves all major aspects of campus life.

Harriet Genung has indicated the interaction of a long-term planning committee at Mount San Antonio College, Walnut, Calif., with the library building architects.<sup>14</sup> This committee, consisting of faculty, administration, librarians, and trustees, established the building requirements and followed through on the many sets of plans drawn over a period of years.

In general, the junior college library building is distinctive among academic libraries because of its small size. An excellent example of this is the architectural gem at Gwynedd-Mercy Junior College in Pennsylvania, only 10,000 square feet.<sup>15</sup> Such smallness in size is not always true, however; a few libraries, such as those at Mount San Antonio College (California) with 82,000 square feet, Foothill College (California) with 38,000, York Junior College (Pennsylvania) with 37,000, and Flint Junior College (Michigan) with 65,000 are larger than the average four-year college library building.<sup>16-20</sup>

The junior college library has become the central storehouse and service agency for campus audio-visual facilities. No trend is more pronounced in these libraries. Special space and equipment are usually provided for such facilities. The new Stephens College Library, the Chicago Teachers College—Northern Branch, San Mateo College, and Mount San Antonio College Libraries are examples in which a determined attempt has been made to establish a large audio-visual center.<sup>21-24</sup>

At Stephens, the idea was to incorporate into the library every teaching device used in the classroom. Listening rooms, booths for tapes and records, film, slide, and filmstrip projection, microfilm viewing, closed-circuit television, and photocopying were all incorporated into the library. This is a major floor space and equipment item in many new libraries. Listening rooms, language laboratories, closed-



circuit television, and production facilities require special space arrangements.

The entire ground floor of the San Mateo College Library is devoted to audio-visual use. Provision has been made for TV and FM studios, laboratories, preview rooms, faculty and student reading rooms, and extensive listening space. In addition, teaching machines, reading accelerators, and table model slide and filmstrip viewers are available for circulation.

The York Junior College Library provides an example of the trend toward the increased use of individual study carrels or stations. Their installation changes the appearance of reading rooms, but caters to the preferences shown by American college students for individual rather than group study tables.

Two additional trends relate to the use of furniture. First is the trend toward the use of carpet for floor covering; carpet controls sound and improves appearance. Second is the use of dark woods and furniture paneling which follows current fashions in industrial design. The lower reflections combined with the use of light wall paints and strong candle power give this furniture a desirable study atmosphere. Foothill has installed bookstacks of these dark woods, while San Mateo has used standard metal from one of the conventional suppliers.

Designers of new junior college library buildings should be alert to newer trends as well as older ones. In ten years, we shall see increased mechanization of library operations requiring certain space adaptations, for instance, at the circulation desk and in the processing departments. The Mount San Antonio College Library uses IBM facilities in circulation control, and the York Junior College Library contains the campus computer center. An IBM control circulation system is used for charging books with all items returned to a central area for discharging and distribution at Mount San Antonio; the system is integrated with IBM machines used in other offices on campus.

Flexibility is a characteristic of no little importance, if only because so many junior colleges have grown rapidly and have needed to enlarge their facilities. And a factor which must never be overlooked is the trend for junior colleges to become senior colleges. Apparently, the new buildings at Stephens and York were built with this change in mind.

It is hazardous to point out any junior college library buildings which have been influential, but probably the Mount San Antonio College Library has influenced the design and scope of other recent li-

### *Building and Equipment Trends: I*

braries, especially in the West, and the Centenary College Library was probably influential a few years earlier in the East.<sup>25</sup>

Undoubtedly, junior college libraries owe much to the helpfulness of the institutes and workshops on library buildings sponsored by the Library Administration Division of the American Library Association (ALA). In the years of their existence, they have contributed much to librarians' understanding of building problems.

There are many new and impressive junior college library buildings and buildings plans. Several were featured at the 1965 ALA Conference sessions on junior college library buildings, among the most impressive of which were:

- A. Henry Ford Community College, Dearborn, Michigan
- B. Los Angeles Valley College, Van Nuys, California
- C. Chaffey College, Alta Loma, California
- D. San Jose City College, San Jose, California
- E. San Antonio College, San Antonio, Texas
- F. Prince George's Community College, Suitland, Maryland.

### *References*

1. American Library Association, Library Administration Division, Buildings and Equipment Section. *Guidelines for Library Planners. Proceedings of the Library Buildings and Equipment Institute, June 18-20, 1959*. Edited by Keith Doms and Howard Rovelstad. Chicago, American Library Association, 1960.
2. American Library Association, Library Administration Division, Buildings and Equipment Section. *Problems in Planning Library Facilities. Proceedings of the Library Buildings Institute*. Edited by William A. Katz and Roderick G. Swartz. Chicago, American Library Association, 1964.
3. American Library Association, Library Administration Division, Buildings and Equipment Section. *Planning Library Buildings for Service. Proceedings of the Library Buildings and Equipment Institute*. Edited by Harold L. Roth. Chicago, American Library Association, 1964.
4. Toffler, Alvin. "Libraries." In *Educational Facilities Laboratories, Inc. Bricks and Mortarboards*. New York, Educational Facilities Laboratories, 1964, pp. 69-98.
5. Ellsworth, Ralph, and Wagener, Hobart D. *The School Library: Facilities for Independent Study in the Secondary School*. New York, Educational Facilities Laboratories, 1963.
6. Ellsworth, Ralph. *Planning the College and University Library Building; A Book for Campus Planners and Architects*. Boulder, Pruett Press, 1960.
7. Merlo, Frank P., and Walling, W. D. *A Guide for Planning Community College Facilities*. New Brunswick, Rutgers University Press, 1964.
8. American Library Association, Library Administration Division, Buildings and Equipment Section. *Library Furniture and Equipment; Proceedings of a*

JOHN F. HARVEY

*Three Day Institute . . . June 14-16, 1962.* Edited by Edward Johnson. Chicago, American Library Association, 1963.

9. Poole, Frazer B., ed. "Library Furniture and Furnishings," *Library Trends*, 13: 385-524, April 1965.

10. Rowland, Ray. "Buildings and Equipment." In Charles L. Trinkner, ed., *Library Services for Junior Colleges*. Northport, Ala., American Southern Press, 1964, pp. 51-77.

11. Samore, Theodore. "Academic Library Buildings: Needs, Legislation, Inventory," *College and Research Libraries*, 25:295-307, July 1964.

12. Harvey, John F. "The Role of the Junior College Library in Classroom Instruction," *Junior College Journal*, 32:441-447, April 1962.

13. Johnston, W. T. "A Glance at Junior College Libraries," *Junior College Journal*, 29:200, Dec. 1958.

14. Genung, Harriet. Dedication Address, Mount San Antonio College Library, Walnut, Calif., Jan. 5, 1964.

15. "Library, Gwynedd Mercy Junior College," *Architectural Record*, 128:146-147, Nov. 1960.

16. Edinger, Jr., Oscar. "Mt. SAC's New Library," *Junior College Journal*, 35:30-33, Nov. 1964.

17. "Mount San Antonio College Library." Information sheets with front elevation plans and building information, 1963.

18. Martin, Elizabeth. "Foothill College Library," *California Librarian*, 24: 153-158, July 1963.

19. York Junior College. *YJC Library*. York, 1964.

20. "Flint Junior College and Flint College, University of Michigan," *Michigan Librarian*, 25:22-24, June 1959.


21. Balanoff, Neal. "James M. Wood Learning Center; A Saturation Experiment at Stephens College," *Audio Visual Instruction*, 8:226-229, April 1963.

22. Emerick, Ralph. Letter dated June 23, 1965.

23. Walker, Robert. "Space and Scholarship; the New Chicago Teachers College—North," *Audio Visual Instruction*, 8:202-205, April 1963.

24. "College of San Mateo Library." Student information sheets with floor plans and descriptions of services, 1963.

25. "Centenary Junior College Library," *Library Journal*, 80:2738-2739, Dec. 1, 1955.



## Building and Equipment Trends: II

LLOYD R. DE GARMO

A SIN OF WHICH JUNIOR college librarians cannot be accused is rushing into print to crow about their new buildings. For the past ten years, there is no dearth of entries in *Library Literature* on library buildings—if you are looking for information on public, college, or university buildings. There is relatively little on junior college buildings. Necessarily then, much of this article is based on the California scene, and personal observation in new junior college libraries in the state. Perhaps the needs of the junior college are not sufficiently distinct that its library cannot fit into the general college pattern.

In 1958 a survey of a selected sample of junior college librarians provided some interesting results: in only 24 per cent was the library separately housed; 53.4 per cent of the librarians felt the buildings or quarters were inadequate.<sup>1</sup> This survey was aimed primarily at colleges of less than 500 enrollment and so was probably not representative. However, the building activity in junior colleges in California (most of them four to five times the size of the surveyed colleges) within the past few years indicates the general need for more adequate buildings. Of the eight libraries for which descriptions were found,<sup>2-9</sup> only one<sup>7</sup> had a building with other than library uses. To my knowledge, no new junior college library has been built in the last few years in California which was not a separate building (besides those with published descriptions, one thinks of Long Beach City College, Cerritos College, East Los Angeles College, and Cabrillo College).

The various aspects of planning libraries have been adequately covered in numerous publications, Sheehan<sup>10</sup> for the small college and the various American Library Association buildings and equipment institutes<sup>11-12</sup> with more general approaches. Librarians are normally interested primarily in the internal layout of the building;

---

The author is Librarian, and Associate Professor, Compton College, Compton, California.

siting and external architectural details are matters over which they have little control or influence.<sup>13</sup> The site will be determined by congeries of educational considerations, varying at each school, but, it is hoped that the result will be a central location. For most junior colleges, in these days of growth, a unified architectural format has been established and the external appearance of the library will fit into the total picture. The librarian need seldom complain that architectural demands overwhelm functional library demands these days, but libraries are still being designed to be striking, if not monumental (Cerritos College Library and the College of San Mateo Library are two outstanding examples). Elizabeth Martin frankly states that Foot-hill College Library was designed to be "monumental, indicating by its appearance its importance in the college community."<sup>14</sup>

Harriet Genung<sup>15</sup> has indicated the interaction of a long term planning committee at Mt. San Antonio College with the architects. This committee, consisting of faculty, administration, librarians, and trustees, established the requirements for the library building and followed through on the many sets of plans drawn up, discarded, and revised over a period of years. This sort of planning is almost classic in that it follows very closely the recommendations of the experts.<sup>16-19</sup> June Biermann indicates a similar planning period.<sup>20</sup> This is certainly a desirable situation, and from the emphasis in the literature on the desirability of such planning, it is evidently one which has not always been obtained in the past.

Detailed planning on the individual campus has resulted in very different appearing libraries, each one the result of institutional educational desiderata. San Mateo's library is a large, flat-roofed pavilion, glass enclosed to two stories on all four sides and prominently placed on campus.<sup>21</sup> Perhaps only on the cool northern California coast could such a vast expanse of glass have been attempted. Except for offices and work spaces it is completely open inside, with the reading rooms two floors in height, overlooked by a mezzanine stack area built over the offices and work spaces. With a present enrollment of over 4,300<sup>22</sup> and a seating capacity of 550, the number of seats provide for only half of those recommended in the Standards for Junior College Libraries.<sup>23</sup> Offices, workrooms, and staff rooms seem to be adequate. With the very light and open construction, the use of rich dark woods in the furniture makes for a happy contrast. The standard steel stacks, with a capacity of 60,000 volumes would appear to provide sufficient space for considerable growth of the student body. Failure to provide

## *Building and Equipment Trends: II*

separate enclosed spaces in which to use the several microfilm readers which the library possesses seems to be a mistake. They are placed in a portion of the reference stack area, and while they can be used in such an area, better lighting conditions could be provided. The large student typing room is a most useful adjunct to the reading area.

The entire ground floor of the San Mateo Library is devoted to audio-visual uses with an extensive program either in affect or planned. Provision has been made for TV and FM studios, dark rooms, preview rooms, faculty and student reading rooms and extensive listening spaces. In addition, teaching machines, reading accelerators, and table model slide and filmstrip viewers are at hand for use in the library, with records and music scores available for circulation.

In contrast with San Mateo, the Mt. San Antonio planning program resulted in a completely windowless, fully air-conditioned structure.<sup>24</sup> Two stories in height, it is set on a slightly rising grade so that the entrance to each floor can be at ground level, the upper floor being devoted entirely to library purposes, and approximately half of the lower floor being devoted to audio-visual services. Here again the audio-visual services are most complete, in great measure designed to serve a future rather than a present program.

The Mt. San Antonio College Library is probably one of the largest (if not the largest) junior college library in the country. Projected total seating capacity of 1,050 (15 per cent of projected enrollment of 7,000) does not satisfy the Standards, but certainly places this library in the large category. The great advance in seating here is that two-thirds of the study spaces consist of individual carrels. The library is modular with most interior walls moveable in case rearrangement is desired. The library is bisected by a central corridor which has information stations and the author-title catalog. Subject libraries of Physical Sciences, and Biological and Applied Sciences, are to one side, with the Social Sciences and Humanities Libraries on the other. Subject catalogs are located in each of the four subject libraries, and each library has a separate entrance and exit controlled by turnstiles at the charging stations. Stacks (for a potential maximum of 100,000 volumes) are of metal as are the furniture and carrels. Because of the moveability feature of the interior arrangement, the library is broken up into many smaller rooms with no really large reading room. Generous use of glass walls gives the library an appearance of being very open.

An IBM circulation control system is used for charging books with

all items returned to a central area for discharging and distribution. The system is integrated with IBM machines used in other offices on campus. Office and work spaces at Mt. San Antonio Library are provided with the same generosity as are other facilities. One detail of planning and construction which is seldom seen but which is very useful is that in each subject library a small closet is provided for library book carts. How often, in how many places, are these very necessary adjuncts of library work simply in the way!

From this most incomplete study of new junior college library buildings can we come to any conclusions as to trends? Perhaps not really, but we can summarize some of the new and old ideas which go into new buildings. For one thing junior college libraries are expected to be among the architecturally most important buildings on campus. Almost all of the descriptions of junior college libraries mention the prominence of site and the importance of architecture. Fortunately these features are now combined with a functional approach to interior design not only in junior college libraries but also in the four year colleges and universities.<sup>25</sup>

Trinkner has written: "Within the past four years several new library buildings of modern design have been added to the campuses of Florida colleges. . . . In contrast with the past concept of locating library quarters in some part of the administration building or part of a classroom building, the library has reached the phase of having an individual well-planned building designed as a campus center."<sup>26</sup> All but one of the eight libraries described in the literature and noted in this article are completely separate structures.

Some aspects of interior design, arrangement, and furniture are of interest and perhaps indicate possible trends. Only Mt. San Antonio College Library varied from the traditional circulation, reference and large reading room arrangement. The use of many smaller study rooms combined with widespread use of glass walls to keep an open appearance seems to be a notable advance. To overcome what might result in lack of supervision and control of such spaces, they have used generously the concept of individual carrels to insure quiet study. Large open reading rooms, although often impressive, have the disadvantage of needing to be carefully supervised just because there are many lively and vivacious teen-agers in one room.

The use of rich dark wood in furniture and paneling at Foothill College, College of San Mateo, and Los Angeles Pierce College follows current fashions in industrial and home design. This is a trend in many

## *Building and Equipment Trends: II*

new libraries being built today.<sup>27</sup> The lower reflection combined with the use of light wall paints and strong light values gives a most desirable study atmosphere. Foothill College and Los Angeles Pierce College have installed book stacks of these dark woods while the other libraries in our small sample have used standard metal from one of the conventional suppliers. Only Foothill College has used carpeting throughout the library.

Air-conditioning was installed in four of the libraries—St. Andrew's Presbyterian College,<sup>28</sup> Mt. San Antonio College,<sup>8</sup> Simmons,<sup>29</sup> and Jones County Junior College.<sup>7</sup> It seems logical that Foothill College and the College of San Mateo should not be air-conditioned since it is hardly needed in cool northern California coastal areas, but Los Angeles Valley and Los Angeles Pierce Colleges are in the San Fernando Valley and it is hot there during many months of the year. If, as seems likely in California at least, we have year round operation in higher education, air-conditioning may become almost a necessity.

The only feature which most of these libraries appear to have in common is the inclusion of some audio-visual facilities within the building. Each varied in its approach from the music listening rooms of Simmons and Jones County to the very complete audio-visual departments of Mt. San Antonio and San Mateo. Only St. Andrew's Presbyterian College made no audio-visual provisions as part of the library service. This and the movement to separate library buildings are probably the only real trends which this paper has uncovered.

One conclusion we can make is that, as for college, university, public, and special library buildings, each junior college library building is a law unto itself, dependent on the community within which it is constructed and must exist for the guidelines which control its every feature. If there are any features which pertain to the junior college library alone, they have not yet been identified. A junior college library building answers to the imperatives which control any building. Paul Schweikher has stated it for us: ". . . a building must have structural stability; it must be weathertight; it must be equipped to control light, air, and temperature; and it must be planned to fit its use."<sup>30</sup>

## *References*

1. Johnson, W. T. "A Glance at Junior College Libraries," *Junior College Journal*, 29:195-202, Dec. 1958.



LLOYD R. DE CARMO

2. Adams, Charles M., and Discussion Leaders. "College Library Buildings Institute: Proceedings," *The Southeastern Librarian*, 11:111-189, Summer 1961.
3. Biermann, June. "A Half Million Dollar's Worth of Experience," *Wilson Library Bulletin*, 36:152-154, Oct. 1961.
4. Sloat, Helene. "The Los Angeles Pierce College Library," *School Library Association of California Bulletin*, 32:29-30, May 1961.
5. Martin, Elizabeth. "Foothill College Library," *California Librarian*, 24: 153-158, July 1963.
6. "New Simmons Library has Opening," *Mississippi Library News*, 25:35-36, March 1961.
7. "Jones Co. Junior College has New Library," *Mississippi Library News*, 27:15, March 1963.
8. "Mt. San Antonio College Library." Information sheets with front elevation, plans, and building information, 1963.
9. "College of San Mateo Library." Student information sheets with floor plans and description of services, 1963.
10. Sheehan, Helen. *The Small College Library*. Westminster, Md., Newman Press, 1963.
11. American Library Association, Buildings Committee. *Planning a Library Building; Proceedings of the Institute Sponsored by the American Library Association Buildings Committee at St. Paul, Minnesota, June 19-20, 1954*. Edited by Hoyt R. Galvin and Kathryn A. Devereaux. Chicago, American Library Association, 1955.
12. American Library Association, Library Administration Division, Buildings and Equipment Section. *Guidelines for Library Planners. Proceedings of the Library Buildings and Equipment Institute, June 8-20, 1959*. Edited by Keith Doms and Howard Rovelstad. Chicago, American Library Association, 1960.
13. Wattenbarger, James L. "Planning Facilities for Junior Colleges," *Junior College Journal*, 30:539-543, May 1960.
14. Martin, *op. cit.*, p. 153.
15. Genung, Harriet. Dedication address, Mt. San Antonio College Library, Walnut, California, Jan. 5, 1964.
16. Sheehan, *op. cit.*, pp. 144-149.
17. Metcalf, Keyes D. "The Librarian's Function in Programming," pp. 3-8; Close, Winston A. "The Architect's Function in Programming," pp. 8-10; Rowe, Howard M. "The Librarian's Function in Preliminary Planning," pp. 11-15; Lashmit, Luther. "The Architect's Function in Preliminary Planning," pp. 15-18; Kaplan, Louis. "The Librarian's Function in Working Drawings," pp. 19-23; Setter, Donald P. "The Architect's Function in Working Drawings," pp. 24-25; *In American . . . Planning a Library . . . , op. cit.*
18. Schweikher, Paul. "The Spaces in Between." *In American . . . Guidelines for . . . , op. cit.*, pp. 7-9.
19. Ellsworth, Ralph E. "Library Buildings." *In* Ralph R. Shaw, ed., *The State of the Library Art*. New Brunswick, N.J., Graduate School of Library Service, Rutgers, The State University, 1960, Vol. 3, Part 1, pp. 24-52.
20. Biermann, *op. cit.*, p. 152.
21. "College of San Mateo Library," *op. cit.*, and visit to the building.

## *Building and Equipment Trends: II*

22. U.S. Office of Education. *Higher Education: Education Directory, 1962-1963, Part 3*. Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963, p. 25.
23. Association of College and Research Libraries, Committee on Standards. "Standards for Junior College Libraries," *College and Research Libraries*, 21: 200-206, May 1960.
24. "Mt. San Antonio College Library," *op. cit.*, and visit to the building.
25. Rovelstad, Howard. "College and University Library Buildings." In Wayne S. Yenawine, ed., *Contemporary Library Design*. Syracuse, N.Y., Syracuse University Press, 1958, p. 26.
26. Trinkner, C. L. "Library Trends in Florida's Junior Colleges," *Junior College Journal*, 30:377-378, March 1960.
27. American Library Association, Library Administration Division, Buildings and Equipment Section. *Library Furniture and Equipment; Proceedings of a Three Day Institute . . . June 14-16, 1962*. Edited by Edward Johnson, *et al.* Chicago, American Library Association, 1963.
28. Adams, *op. cit.*, p. 129.
29. "New Simmons Library Has Opening," *op. cit.*, p. 35.
30. Schweikher, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

Appendix: A Summary of *The Community College Library: A Plan for Action*\*

HELEN WHEELER

RECENT YEARS have seen the founding of new community colleges as well as the reorganization of many older colleges aiming to function as community colleges. Generally, this has meant a relatively large enrollment of both men and women of all ages in a public, junior college offering terminal and transfer programs. Curricula are often built around a group of required, general education courses. Distinctive of the "community college" are the emphases on surveying the needs of and working with the college's community—whether it is a large geographical area or a section of a city—and on the provision of guidance, counseling, and testing services often associated with remedial work. Technologies such as electronics, foods, library, and business may be offered in the terminal programs as areas of concentration. In the functioning community college, technologies and other terminal curricula are of lower-division collegiate level and caliber, rather than an extension of high school, and they may lead to one of the Associate degrees.

Community colleges, then, usually have in common five characteristics growing out of their unique functions:

1. They cost the student relatively little to attend.
2. Most high school graduates and adults can be admitted.
3. The objectives and curricula are comprehensive and include lower-division-type and general education courses as well as programs of an occupational nature for those who do not plan to transfer to a senior college.
4. Students with subject and academic deficiencies are assisted through special remedial classes, and considerable emphasis is

---

Miss Wheeler is Associate Professor at the University of Hawaii Graduate School of Library Studies.

\* She is the author of *The Community College Library: A Plan for Action*, Hamden, Conn., Shoe String Press, 1965.

## Appendix: A Summary of *College Library: A Plan for Action*

placed on guidance and counseling of students who have not made firm decisions regarding their educational and vocational plans.

5. Students are able to prepare for transfer to the upper-division of senior colleges with equality.

The community college can serve the educational, personal, and economic needs of many Americans today. It follows that the library program of this unique college should be characterized by unique functions, and the community college library program has had its share of problems in identifying these functions and carrying out programs to support them. In 1961, the writer undertook a doctoral project at Columbia University Teachers College in the area of community college library programming, part of which was a comprehensive questionnaire (circa 1963) directed to community college library directors. The work led to the book, *The Community College Library: A Plan for Action*,<sup>1</sup> containing six case studies of representative library programs. Of the 103 responding community colleges, only six had at least 20,000-volume collections, seating for 25 per cent of the full-time-equivalent enrollment, and a staff of at least two professional librarians. Of these six above-average programs, only three had budgets which were at least 5 per cent of the college budget, and they were barely 5 per cent.<sup>2</sup>

Implications for the truly effective and functioning community college library program lie in the areas of both the library director and the college president, and are also described. Library practice was examined by means of the questionnaire, based in part on the American Library Association standards;<sup>3</sup> the practice as determined from responses was judged by means of criteria. Following validation of each of the criteria, illustrative measures of the extent to which it was a part of a library's program are suggested and described. The measures were constructed as objectively as possible; if a substantial number received a positive reply, or comments and descriptive statements indicated confirmation of the measure, there was a likelihood that the criterion was being met. The criteria and measures of the successful community college library program appear in *The Community College Library*.<sup>4</sup>

There are three general conclusions from the comparison of current community college library practice, as revealed in the data coming from the questionnaire, with the criteria established. The community

college library needs an over-all general improvement quantitatively and qualitatively to provide minimal basic library service. When discussing problems and limitations upon effectiveness and success of their programs, community college library directors cite the size of collections, physical facilities (especially seating), and adequate staffing. Of the community college libraries represented, 63 per cent have less than 20,000 volumes; 75 per cent lack seating for at least 25 per cent of their students; and in 31 per cent of them, the respondent comprises the entire library staff! <sup>5</sup>

Although there are varied general as well as specialized ways in which the library program can best serve the unique needs and functions of the community college program, the library is now most often unable to serve its institution effectively because it lacks financial support. The library directors' statements include reminders that such conditions add up to the problem of budgetary provision. The suggestion that they produce ingenious and unique techniques of library service to the community college is futile, for all of their efforts are spent on maintenance of a day-to-day program with the means currently provided them.

The community college administrator should ascertain whether the best interests of the library program are being served. With the library director, he should study the library's organization, staffing, problems, and goals to determine how well they fulfill instructional and other functions. Community college administrators and planners should make every effort to obtain a capable library director at the earliest possible moment in the development of the college. A minimum of 5 per cent of the institutional budget should be devoted to the library maintenance program, exclusive of audio-visual materials, after the first five years of the college's existence. In new community colleges, basic library collection and equipment should be part of the initial financial outlay, planned and developed before the first classes are held. Where community colleges are going into new buildings, the library director should be able to work with the architect. Many inadequate and unsuccessful community college library programs have been the result of the assumption that basic book stock could be acquired over a period of years, even though the annual budget available for the community college library is often inadequate for even current maintenance.

The need for exceptionally well qualified community college faculty should be recognized as directly related to the success of the library

## Appendix: A Summary of *College Library: A Plan for Action*

program. Community college libraries should be entirely independent of the libraries of other institutions. The library director should have faculty status equivalent to that of a departmental chairman. The local organization and ways of working should be such that the library director has communication with the community college president (or chief administrator) and (academic) dean.

The library director should give support for and seek implementation of the ALA standards, especially in the areas of staffing, collection, and seating. Special provision to meet the unique needs of the community college student through library instruction and staffing is recommended. Efforts by instructors to integrate library use and course work, aside from reserve books, are unimpressive, and their efforts to encourage general reading are negligible. Provision for required adequate library instruction, rather than the traditional orientation to new facilities (which assumes general knowledge of library techniques and resources) is therefore essential. A library instruction course should be required of all new full-time community college students, and library orientation should be provided for others. At least two staff members, one of whom is a librarian, should be on duty whenever the library is open to its public. There should be at least two librarians on the staff of every community college library. Clerical personnel, rather than students, should be assigned to circulation desk duty.

Community college library planning should include the provision of a basic collection of at least 20,000 titles, fully cataloged and processed, ready for classes. The community college library program should be developed to provide for *all* of the needs of its students and most of its faculty. The reserve system as presently conceived should be deemphasized and replaced with open reserves, course shelves, and almost no closed reserves. A new community college library should be planned to include a library classroom, open stacks to accommodate a collection of at least 30,000 volumes and other ample storage, workroom, cataloging, and office facilities, study carrels, student conference and typing rooms, browsing area or room, seating for at least 25 per cent of the anticipated full-time equivalent enrollment, and controlled, single-exit flow of traffic.

Several ideas and techniques were mentioned by library directors as possible supportive means to improve community college library programming. They felt that it is the responsibility of their group to encourage development of certain products and ideas as well as to be willing to experiment with the results. The support of the profession

should be given to the movement to produce an up-to-date basic bibliography for community college library collections, to secure commercial and centralized processing for all types of relevant publications, to design a package of 10,000 cataloged titles, and to produce a film suitable for community college library instruction. They felt that the audio-visual program should be housed in the library building and coordinated with the library program; there should be at least one member of the community college staff who is an audio-visual specialist and able to devote full-time to the audio-visual program. All possible techniques should be utilized to bring the student and the library together. (Although not essential to the support of a community college library program, a successful library technology program can be one contribution of some community college libraries to their institutions' unique services.)

Librarians should continue to strive toward improved library programming through membership in professional organizations and local and national activities. For their part, professional groups representing library service, the junior college, and public education should work together towards realization of their mutual goals. A joint, ongoing committee representing the American Association of Junior Colleges and the Association of College and Research Libraries would be a good start. There are implications here for schools of education and professional library service as well. Classes, workshops, conferences, and consultations should be further developed in the areas of community college library service, administration, instructional materials, and audio-visual aids. Continued progress in teacher education which is more library-minded than in the past will improve the situation at all levels of public education.

### *References*

1. Wheeler, Helen. *The Community College Library; A Plan for Action*. Hamden, Conn., Shoe String Press, 1965.
2. *Ibid.*, pp. 79-80.
3. ACRL Committee on Standards. "Standards for Junior College Libraries," *College and Research Libraries*, 21:200-206, May 1960.
4. Wheeler, *op. cit.*, p. 9.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 80.

# COMPLETE LIST OF LIBRARY TRENDS ISSUES IN PRINT

	<i>Title</i>	<i>Editor</i>	<i>Date</i>
V. 1, N. 1	Current Trends in College and University Libraries	R. B. Downs	July 1952
1 2	Current Trends in Special Libraries	H. H. Henkle	Oct. 1952
1 3	Current Trends in School Libraries	Alise Lohrer	Jan. 1953
1 4	Current Trends in Public Libraries	Herbert Goldhor	April 1953
V. 2, N. 1	Current Trends in Libraries of the U. S. Government	Verner W. Clapp	July 1953
2 2	Current Trends in Cataloging and Classification	Scott Adams	
2 3	Scientific Management in Libraries	Maurice F. Tauber	Oct. 1953
2 4	Availability of Library Research Materials	Ralph R. Shaw	Jan. 1954
		Dorothy M. Crosland	April 1954
		William P. Kellam	
V. 3, N. 1	Current Trends in Personnel Administration	Bernard Van Horne	July 1954
3 2	Services to Readers	Leslie W. Dunlap	Oct. 1954
3 3	Library Associations in the United States and the British Commonwealth		
3 4	Current Acquisitions Trends in American Libraries	David H. Clift	Jan. 1955
		Robert Vosper	April 1955
V. 4, N. 1	Current Trends in National Libraries	David C. Mearns	July 1955
4 2	Special Materials and Services	Andrew H. Horn	Oct. 1955
4 3	Conservation of Library Materials	Maurice F. Tauber	Jan. 1956
4 4	State and Provincial Libraries in the United States and Canada		
		Paxton P. Price	April 1956
V. 5, N. 1	American Books Abroad	Dan Lacy	July 1956
		Charles Bolte	
5 2	Mechanization in Libraries	Peter S. Jennison	
5 3	Manuscripts and Archives	Arnold H. Trotter	Oct. 1956
5 4	Rare Book Libraries and Collections	R. W. G. Vail	Jan. 1957
		Howard H. Peckham	April 1957
V. 6, N. 1	Current Trends in Circulation Services	Wayne S. Yenawine	July 1957
6 2	Research in Librarianship	A. A. L. S. Committee on Research	
6 3	Building Library Resources Through Cooperation	Ralph T. Esterquest	Oct. 1957
6 4	Legal Aspects of Library Administration	John B. Kaiser	Jan. 1958
			April 1958
V. 7, N. 1	Current Trends in Book Publishing	Frank L. Schick	July 1958
7 2	Aspects of Library Public Relations	Len Arnold	Oct. 1958
7 3	Current Trends in Library Administration	Ernest J. Reece	Jan. 1959
7 4	Current Trends in Bibliography	Roy B. Stokes	April 1959
V. 8, N. 1	Current Trends in Adult Education	C. Walter Stone	July 1959
8 2	Current Trends in Newly Developing Countries	Wilfred J. Plumble	Oct. 1959
8 3	Photoduplication in Libraries	James E. Skipper	Jan. 1960
8 4	Music Libraries and Librarianship	Vincent Duckles	April 1960
V. 9, N. 1	State Aid to Public Libraries	S. Janice Kee	July 1960
9 2	Current Trends in Theological Libraries	Niels H. Sonne	Oct. 1960
9 3	Current Trends in Bookmobiles	Harold Goldstein	Jan. 1961
9 4	Current Trends in Antiquarian Books	Hellmut Lehmann-Haupt	
			April 1966
V. 10, N. 1	Future of Library Service: Demographic Aspects and Implications, Part I	Frank L. Schick	July 1961
10 2	Future of Library Service: Demographic Aspects and Implications, Part II		
10 3	Current Trends in U. S. Periodical Publishing	Frank L. Schick	Oct. 1961
10 4	Urban University Libraries	Helen M. Welch	Jan. 1962
		Maurice F. Tauber	
		Lorena A. Garloch	April 1962
V. 11, N. 1	Library Boards	J. Archer Eggen	July 1962
11 2	Bibliotherapy	Ruth M. Tews	Oct. 1962
11 3	Law Libraries	Bernita J. Davies	Jan. 1963
11 4	Financial Administration of Libraries	Ralph H. Parker	April 1963
		Paxton P. Price	
V. 12, N. 1	Public Library Service to Children	Winifred C. Ladley	July 1963
12 2	Education for Librarianship Abroad in Selected Countries	Harold Laneour	Oct. 1963
12 3	Current Trends in Reference Services	J. Clement Harrison	
12 4	European University Libraries: Current Status and Developments	Margaret Knox Goggin	Jan. 1964
		Robert Vosper	April 1964
V. 13, N. 1	Research Methods in Librarianship	Guy Garrison	July 1964
13 2	State and Local History in Libraries	Clyde Walton	Oct. 1964
13 3	Regional Public Library Systems	Hannis S. Smith	Jan. 1965
13 4	Library Furniture and Furnishings	Frazer G. Poole	April 1965
V. 14, N. 1	Metropolitan Public Library Problems Around the World	H. C. Campbell	July 1965



# Library Trends

Forthcoming numbers are as follows:

January, 1966, *Library Service to Industry*. Co-Editors: Katherine G. Harris, Reference Services Director, Detroit Public Library, and Eugene B. Jackson, Director of Information Retrieval and Library Services, IBM Corporation, Armonk, N.Y.

April, 1966, *Current Trends in Branch Libraries*. Editor: Andrew Geddes, Director, The Nassau Library System, Hempstead, Long Island, New York.

July, 1966, *U.S. Government Documents*. Editor: Thomas S. Shaw, Visiting Professor, Louisiana State University, Library School, Baton Rouge, La.

October, 1966, *Current Trends in Collection Development in University Libraries*. Editor: Jerrold Orne, University Librarian, The University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.